

1 UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT

2 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

3 -oOo-

4 In Re:) Case No. 2:17-Bk-21386-SK
5 ZETTA JET USA, INC., ET AL.) Chapter 7
6 Debtors.) Los Angeles, California
7) Wednesday, February 15, 2023
8) 9:00 AM

9 ADV#: 2:19-ap-01382-SK
10 KING v. JETCRAFT CORPORATION,
11 ET AL.

12 #10.00 HRG RE CHAPTER 7
13 TRUSTEE'S SEVENTH MOTION
14 UNDER LBR 2016-2 AND BK CODE
15 SECTION 105 FOR APPROVAL OF
16 CASH DISBURSEMENTS NECESSARY
17 FOR THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE
18 DEBTORS' ESTATES
19 DOCKET 2040

20 #11.00 HRG RE CHAPTER 7
21 TRUSTEE'S MOTION FOR ORDER
22 APPROVING SETTLEMENT
23 AGREEMENT BY AND AMONG THE
24 CHAPTER 7 TRUSTEE AND
25 JETCRAFT CORPORATION,
JETCRAFT GLOBAL, INC.,
JETCOAST 5000-5 LLC,
ORION AIRCRAFT HOLDINGS LTD.,
JETCRAFT ASIA LIMITED,
FK GROUP LTD,
FK PARTNERS LIMITED,
AND JAHID FAZAL-KARIM
DOCKET 1995

1 #12.00 STATUS CONFERENCE RE
2 COMPLAINT
3 DEFENDANT(S): FK PARTNERS
4 LIMITED, JETCRAFT
5 DEFENDANT(S), FAZAL-KARIM,
6 BOMBARDIER DEFENDANT(S), AND
7 ECN CAPITAL
8 FR. 12-11-19, 1-22-20, 3-11,
9 7-22, 9-30, 10-14, 2-17-21,
10 3-31, 6-30, 7-14, 9-15, 4-27-
11 22, 6-29, 10-12, 11-08, 11-
12 30,
13 DOCKET 1

8 #13.00 HRG RE FOURTH INTERIM
9 APPLICATION OF DLA PIPER
10 FOR ALLOWANCE OF COMPENSATION
11 FOR SERVICES RENDERED AND FOR
12 REIMBURSEMENT OF EXPENSES
13 AS COUNSEL TO THE CHAPTER 7
14 TRUSTEE
15 PERIOD: 7/1/2021 TO 9/30/2021
16 FEE: \$1,604,684.00, EXPENSES:
17 \$78,846.07
18 FR. 3-2-22, 3-9, 4-27, 6-29,
19 10-12, 11-08, 1-25-23,
20 DOCKET 1729

15 #14.00 HRG RE FIFTH INTERIM
16 APPLICATION OF DLA PIPER FOR
17 ALLOWANCE OF COMPENSATION FOR
18 SERVICES RENDERED AND FOR
19 REIMBURSEMENT OF EXPENSES
20 INCURRED AS COUNSEL TO THE
21 CHAPTER 7 TRUSTEE
22 PERIOD: 10/1/2021 TO
23 3/31/2022,
24 FEE: \$3,113,631.50, EXPENSES:
25 \$95,019.68
FR. 10-12-22, 11-08, 1-25-23,
FR. 6-29-22
DOCKET 1852

1 #15.00 HRG RE SIXTH INTERIM
2 APPLICATION OF DLA PIPER
3 FOR ALLOWANCE OF COMPENSATION
4 FOR SERVICES RENDERED AND FOR
5 REIMBURSEMENT OF EXPENSES
6 INCURRED AS COUNSEL TO THE
7 CHAPTER 7 TRUSTEE
8 PERIOD: 4/1/2022 TO 6/30/2022
9 FEE: \$1,603,758.50, EXPENSES:
10 \$27,967.45.
11 FR. 11-08-22, 1-25-23,
12 DOCKET 1949

13 #16.00 HRG RE SEVENTH INTERIM
14 APPLICATION OF DLA PIPER
15 FOR ALLOWANCE OF COMPENSATION
16 FOR SERVICES
17 RENDERED AND FOR
18 REIMBURSEMENT OF EXPENSES
19 INCURRED AS COUNSEL TO THE
20 CHAPTER 7 TRUSTEE
21 PERIOD: 7/1/2022 TO
22 9/30/2022,
23 FEE: \$1,067,827.00, EXPENSES:
24 \$27,341.26
25 FR. 1-25-23,
DOCKET 2018

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
BEFORE THE HONORABLE SANDRA R. KLEIN
UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY JUDGE

17 APPEARANCES (All present by video or telephone):
18 For the FK and Jetcraft MICHAEL J. CIATTI, ESQ.
19 Defendants: King & Spalding LLP
20 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue Northwest
21 Suite 900
22 Washington, DC 20006
23 (202)661-7828
24
25 For the Chapter 7 Trustee, JONATHAN D. KING, ESQ.
Jonathan D. King: JOE ROSELIUS, ESQ.
JOHN K. LYONS, ESQ.
JEFFREY S. TOROSIAN, ESQ.
DLA Piper LLP (US)
444 West Lake Street
Suite 900
Chicago, IL 60606
(312)368-7034

For the Jetcraft Settling Defendants: JONATHAN W. JORDAN, ESQ., PRO HAC VICE

King & Spalding LLP
1180 Peachtree Street Northeast
Suite 1600
Atlanta, GA 30309
(404)572-3568

For Universal Leader Investment Ltd. and Glove Assets Investment Ltd.: MICHAEL B. BERNSTEIN, ESQ.
Arnold & Porter Kaye Scholer LLP
601 Massachusetts Ave, Northwest
Washington, DC 20001
(202)942-5227

For the Bombardier Entities: CAROLINA A. FORNOS, ESQ.
Pillsbury Winthrop Shaw Pittman
LLP
31 West 52nd Street
New York, NY 10019
(212)858-1000

For the Fee Examiner, Nancy Rapoport: J. SCOTT BOVITZ, ESQ.
Bovitz & Spitzer
1100 Wilshire Boulevard
Suite 2403
Los Angeles, CA 90017
(213)346-8300

For Objecting Creditor, CAVIC Aviation Leasing (Ireland) 22 Co. DAC: KRISTINA S. AZLIN, ESQ.
Holland & Knight LLP
400 South Hope Street
8th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90071
(213)896-2400

For Former Employees on DLA Piper Applications: BLAKE J. LINDEMANN, ESQ.
Lindemann Law Firm, APC
9777 Wilshire Boulevard
4th Floor
Beverly Hills, CA 90212
(310)279-5269

Also Present: Prof. Nancy B. Rapoport
Fee Examiner

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17 Court Recorder:

WANDA TOLIVER
United States Bankruptcy Court
Edward R. Roybal Federal Building
255 East Temple Street
Room 940
Los Angeles, CA 90012
(855)460-9641

21 Transcriber:

RIVER WOLFE
eScribers, LLC
7227 N. 16th Street
Suite #207
Phoenix, AZ 85020
(800) 257-0885

24

25 Proceedings recorded by electronic sound recording;
transcript provided by transcription service.

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

6

1 LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 2023, 9:29 AM

2 -oOo-

3 (Call to order of the Court.)

4 THE CLERK: Please come to order. This court is now
5 in session, the Honorable Sandra R. Klein presiding.

6 THE COURT: Good morning. This is Judge Klein. And
7 even though we're not in the courtroom, today is an official
8 court hearing, and everyone is expected to treat it like they
9 would if they were in court. The audio of today's hearing is
10 being recorded, so each time you speak and each time you speak
11 after someone else has spoken, please identify yourself so that
12 the record is clear.

13 The remaining matters on calendar are all in this
14 Zetta Jet case. I'm going to take all appearances now. I'm
15 just going to go in the order that I see people on the screen.
16 If you wish to record your appearance, please turn your video
17 on. If I don't see your video on, I will not call on you.

18 So the first person I see is Mr. Ciatti.

19 MR. CIATTI: Good morning, Your Honor. Michael Ciatti
20 from King & Spalding on behalf of the FK and Jetcraft
21 defendants.

22 THE COURT: Good morning.

23 Mr. Roselius.

24 MR. ROSELIUS: Morning, Your Honor. Joe Roselius on
25 behalf of the trustee.

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

7

1 THE COURT: Good morning.

2 Mr. King.

3 MR. KING: Good morning, Your Honor. Jon King, the
4 Chapter 7 trustee.

5 THE COURT: Good morning.

6 Mr. Jordan.

7 MR. JORDAN: Good morning, Your Honor. Jon Jordan of
8 King & Spalding on behalf of the Jetcraft settling defendants.
9 I have a pro hac that is pending before the Court.

10 THE COURT: Thank you.

11 Mr. Bernstein.

12 MR. BERNSTEIN: Yes. Good morning, Your Honor.
13 Michael Bernstein of Arnold & Porter on behalf of Universal
14 Leader Investments and Glove Asset Investments.

15 THE COURT: Good morning.

16 Mr. Lyons.

17 MR. LYONS: Good morning, Your Honor. John Lyons on
18 behalf of the trustee.

19 THE COURT: Good morning.

20 Ms. Fornos.

21 MS. FORNOS: Good morning, you Honor. Caroline Fornos
22 with Pillsbury Winthrop on behalf of the Bombardier entities.

23 THE COURT: Good morning.

24 Mr. Bovitz.

25 MR. BOVITZ: Good morning. J. Scott Bovitz, Bovitz &

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

8

1 Spitzer, on behalf of the fee examiner, Nancy Rapoport.

2 THE COURT: Good morning.

3 Mr. Torosian.

4 MR. TOROSIAN: Good morning, Your Honor. Jeff
5 Torosian of DLA Piper for the trustee.

6 THE COURT: Good morning.

7 Prof. Rapoport.

8 PROF. RAPOPORT: Good morning, Your Honor. Nancy
9 Rapoport, fee examiner.

10 THE COURT: Good morning.

11 Ms. Azlin.

12 MS. AZLIN: Good morning, Your Honor. Kristina Azlin
13 with Holland & Knight on behalf of objecting creditor, CAVIC
14 Aviation Leasing Ireland 22 Company DAC.

15 THE COURT: Good morning.

16 I don't see any other videos on, so I'll assume no one
17 else wishes to be heard today.

18 MR. LINDEMANN: Your Honor, this is Blake Lindemann.
19 I'm appearing via audio on former employees on the DLA Piper
20 applications only.

21 THE COURT: Okay. Hold on. I'm going to change your
22 screen name, Mr. Lindemann.

23 MR. LINDEMANN: Thank you.

24 THE COURT: Oh, someone already got you. Okay.
25 Perfect.

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

9

1 Anyone else who wishes to be heard?

2 Okay. Before we get started, I want to put on the
3 record that my term law clerk was invited to a judicial
4 clerkship event in late January of this year. She did not
5 realize that it was hosted by a law firm, and in particular, by
6 King & Spalding, who represent the FK and Jetcraft defendants,
7 until after she arrived at the restaurant where the event was
8 being held.

9 During the event, she engaged in small talk only. She
10 did not discuss any case that is before me, nor did she discuss
11 the inner workings of my chambers. A week later, when I
12 learned that she had attended the event, my law clerk sent an
13 email to everyone at King & Spalding whose email addresses she
14 had. In that email, my law clerk stated the following.

15 She did not realize the event was hosted by a law firm
16 and in particular that firm. If she had, she would not have
17 RSVP'd or participated. She also stated that she would not
18 apply for a position with King & Spalding during her clerkship
19 or at any time in the future, and she would not entertain any
20 unsolicited offers from that firm during her clerkship or at
21 any time in the future.

22 Since participating in the event, my term law clerk
23 did not do any substantive work on the 9019 motion or any other
24 Zetta Jet matter. She has been walled off from all Zetta Jet
25 matters, and she will continue to be walled off for the

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

10

1 remainder of her clerkship. I believe that there is nothing
2 more that needs to be said regarding this matter, and I intend
3 to move forward with today's hearings.

4 I would like to start with matter number 11, the 9019
5 motion. Who will be arguing on behalf of the trustee?

6 MR. ROSELIUS: Good morning, Your Honor. Joe Roselius
7 for the trustee.

8 THE COURT: Okay. And Ms. Fornos, I assume you'll be
9 arguing on behalf of BAC?

10 MS. FORNOS: Yes, Your Honor.

11 THE COURT: Okay. And I issued an order in terms of
12 the procedures.

13 So Mr. Roselius, you'll have fifteen minutes. Ms.
14 Fornos, you'll have fifteen minutes. Mr. Roselius, if you want
15 to reserve time to respond, you can. And then there will be
16 five minutes, Mr. Roselius, to address the position papers by
17 CAVIC as well as Universal Leader.

18 So Mr. Roselius, would you like to reserve any time?

19 MR. ROSELIUS: Your Honor, just one point of
20 clarification. Mr. Lyons will also be arguing the CAVIC and
21 Universal Leader pieces of this.

22 THE COURT: Okay. That's fine. That's fine. So for
23 the first fifteen minutes, which addresses the Bombardier
24 response, Mr. Roselius, would you like to reserve any time?

25 MR. ROSELIUS: Three minutes, Your Honor.

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

11

1 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

2 So I'll ask that my staff set the clock for twelve
3 minutes, and then you'll have three minutes to respond.

4 All right. And I am going to be typing. Sometimes I
5 write in longhand, but it's easier to type, so I'm going to be
6 typing while you speak.

7 Okay. Mr. Roselius, the floor is yours.

8 MR. ROSELIUS: Thank you, Your Honor.

9 Just a brief overview of the settlement, under the
10 terms of the settlement, the settling defendants will pay 9.5
11 million to the trustee in two installments, one after approval,
12 another in July of this year. And the settlement includes some
13 significant protections for the trustee if the settling
14 defendants are unable to make the second payment, either to
15 take a consent judgment or retain the first installment and
16 continue the litigation. The settling defendants are also
17 agreeing to withdraw proofs of claim and then a mutual general
18 release. And then really what is, I think, the focus of the
19 discussion here today is a good-faith settlement finding under
20 California Civil Code Section 877.6 and a bar order reflecting
21 the same.

22 So just to start with the 9019 factors, the Court need
23 only determine that the settlement agreement is reasonable,
24 fair, and equitable and that the proposed settlement exceeds
25 the lowest point in the range of reasonableness, giving

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

12

1 deference to the trustee's business judgment. And the
2 considerations include probability of success in the
3 litigation; difficulties, if any, with collection; complexity,
4 expense, inconvenience, and delay of continuing litigation; and
5 then the interest of the creditors in getting the largest
6 possible recovery as quickly as possible.

7 The proposed settlement needs all of those factors.
8 It's well within the range of reasonableness considering the
9 surviving claims, the claims that are on appeal against the
10 settling defendants, the inherent risk of litigation, the
11 ongoing burden and expense, the profits that we allege were
12 earned by the settling defendants, and perhaps most
13 significantly, the collection risk, both based on the overall
14 financial status of the settling defendants and the
15 international nature of the settling defendants in their
16 business, including the potential need to collect in foreign
17 countries. So taking all that into account, the trustee
18 believes the settlement is in the best interests of the
19 creditors.

20 In terms of Bombardier's objection, first, the Court
21 may enter a bar order in connection with a 9019 settlement
22 motion. A number of cases cited in our reply have held the
23 entry of a bar order pursuant to a settlement does not require
24 a separate adversary proceeding. None of the objecting parties
25 have cited a case from the Ninth Circuit that holds otherwise.

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

13

1 The Hartog case from Florida, which we cited in our brief, is
2 the closest to the fact pattern here. The district court
3 affirmed a bar order in a 9019 order and expressly rejected the
4 Rule 7001 argument Bombardier makes.

5 Other cases besides Hartog, also cited in our reply at
6 pages 4 and 5, approved similar bar orders in the 9019 context.
7 That's Land Resource, Fundamental Long Term Care, Superior
8 Homes and Investments, and Munford.

9 The objecting parties cite no case from the Ninth
10 Circuit holding otherwise in the context of a statutory
11 settlement bar, like Section 877.6. They only cite Zale, a
12 Fifth Circuit case that is not binding on this Court, and it's
13 not in the context of a statutory bar.

14 Hartog and the other cases we cited provide the better
15 approach to approving a litigation bar authorized by Section
16 877.6 for several reasons. First, the text of Rule 7001(7)
17 addresses equitable relief, not a statutory bar like what's at
18 issue here. It refers to injunctions and other equitable
19 relief. It addresses, essentially, injunctions governed by
20 Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 65, which incorporates the four
21 well-known prongs for injunctive relief, irreparable harm, lack
22 of adequate remedy at law, balancing of equities, and public
23 interest.

24 In this case, those equitable tests are not relevant
25 to the contribution bar because it involves no balancing of the

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

14

1 equities. It's really a black-letter statutory test governed
2 by six different standards that are described in our brief on
3 page 6. And I'll get to those, how they apply to this specific
4 settlement, in a minute. But here, the settlement meeting
5 these different factors as a matter of law bars contribution
6 claims of the type set out in the proposed order.

7 So second, Bankruptcy Code Section 105 permits the
8 court to enter an injunction through the 9019 process. That's
9 in Hartog as well. It talks about how Section 105 gives the
10 court the procedural power to enter a bar as long as it is not
11 the kind of prohibition that you would have to look to Rule 65
12 to obtain. And it's important to note here, Your Honor, that
13 the issue is not whether Section 105 creates a substantive
14 right to a contribution bar, only that Section 105 gives the
15 Court procedural order to consider a substantive right created
16 by the California statute.

17 Third, Bankruptcy Rule 7016 governs the adversary
18 proceeding the trustee is settling. It gives the Court broad
19 authority to take any appropriate action to settle a case or
20 use special procedures to assist in resolving the dispute. And
21 in this case, the California Code Section 105 and the All Writs
22 Act provide the substantive and procedural authorization to
23 enter the settlement order.

24 The Zale case is not only not binding on this Court,
25 but it doesn't address these points. It involved an injunction

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

15

1 under Rule 65, not a statutory bar. It did not take into
2 account the effect of Rule 7016 or the All Writs Act. It
3 simply assumed that Rule 7001 would apply to the statutory --
4 to statutory settlement bars.

5 And we also cited the Mirant case, decided within the
6 Fifth Circuit after Zale, and in Mirant, the district court
7 approved the settlement with an injunction in connection with
8 the 363 sale motion. A separate adversary proceeding was
9 required for the injunction because it was part of the 363
10 order, just as the contribution bar is part of the 9019 order.

11 Requiring an adversary proceeding here would be
12 duplicative because the order settles an adversary proceeding.
13 We already have an adversary proceeding with Bombardier, the
14 one we are settling right now. It'd be redundant and
15 inefficient to open another adversary proceeding simply to
16 settle this one -- to settle the first one. The 9019 motion,
17 was served in accordance with Bankruptcy Rule 2002, so it went
18 to far more parties than would have applied in a simple
19 adversary proceeding. Bombardier also doesn't point to any
20 procedural rights that it was denied -- that it would have
21 received if this had been open as an adversary proceeding.

22 The requirements to approve this motion under Rule
23 9019 are effectively a finding that California Code Section
24 877.6 applies. And if you approve this settlement motion, then
25 almost by definition, Section 877.6 would apply. But we also

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

16

1 meet the factors in 877.6, and it's Bombardier's burden, not
2 ours, to show that those factors have not been met. A separate
3 adversary proceeding would only affirm what we're asking for in
4 the 9019 motion, with the additional time and expense lost from
5 opening up a new adversary proceeding. And so as a practical
6 matter, a new adversary proceeding would be no different from
7 this contested motion.

8 Now, moving on to the next point, California law, not
9 New York law, governs these issues because California law
10 governs the tort claims against the settling defendants. And
11 thus, the settling defendants should be afforded the
12 protections of Section 877.6. We cited the Nucorp Energy case
13 that chose California law over New York and Texas in a similar
14 context.

15 Now, Bombardier contends that the claims bar should be
16 denied because it seeks to bind nonparties to California law,
17 but that's not really the right way to look at this. The Court
18 has determined that California law applies to the claims
19 against the defendants, and Bombardier cites nothing for the
20 idea that the state law that governs claims against it should
21 govern other parties' settlements. It's telling that
22 Bombardier cites no authority for this position, despite good-
23 faith settlement issues that come up in tort settlements in
24 hundreds of courtrooms across the country each day. If the
25 Court accepted Bombardier's position, the Court would have to

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

17

1 identify and rule on all possible state laws that might apply
2 to all possible claims that might involve all possible third
3 parties before approving any settlement. That would be
4 inefficient and wasteful.

5 It also cites nothing for the more specific
6 proposition that Bombardier's choice of law in purchase
7 agreements to which the settling defendants were not parties
8 would affect the choice of law governing the settlement, or why
9 New York law would govern when, for example, Quebec law governs
10 its agreements with the settling defendants. It cites several
11 inapposite cases in a string cite on page 10 of its brief, but
12 none involved the California settlement statute at issue here,
13 and they only apply for the unremarkable proposition that
14 settlement agreements do not bind nonparties. Nucorp, I think,
15 is more persuasive here and involves a more direct, factually-
16 analogous situation.

17 In terms of whether the bar order exceeds the scope of
18 Section 877.6, the trustee and the settling defendants have
19 agreed to submit a revised bar order, making clear that its
20 scope matches that of the statute. And the relief in the
21 revised bar order will be the same as the relief under the
22 statute.

23 Moving on to the good-faith settlement factors, so
24 Bombardier contends that the trustee has not satisfied the
25 good-faith factors. But it really focus only on proportionate

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

18

1 liability, and that's incorrect for several reasons.

2 First, Bombardier has the proof to show that the
3 settlement was not made in good faith under Section 877.6. The
4 considerations are not just proportionate liability. There's
5 at least five other considerations, and it's more of a
6 totality-of-the-circumstances test. Those include the amount
7 paid in the settlement, recognition that the settlor should pay
8 less than it would have if found liable after trial, the
9 allocation of settlement proceeds, the financial conditions and
10 insurance limits of the settling defendants, which is
11 effectively collectability, and then evidence of collusion,
12 fraud, or tortious conduct.

13 Bombardier fails to meet its burden to show that the
14 settlement is so far out of the ballpark and grossly
15 disproportionate to be inconsistent with the objectives of
16 Section 877.6, which are to encourage settlement without
17 permitting a bad-faith settlement. Bombardier tries to make
18 this a math problem, but the Court is not required to determine
19 liability with precision, or say, with exactitude, that the
20 settlement is exactly what the settling defendants' share of
21 proportionate liability would be.

22 And here, the collectability risk alone shows that the
23 settlement was made in good faith. As the Tech-Bilt court
24 noted, one of the considerations is the financial conditions
25 and insurance policy limits of settling defendants. Bombardier

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

19

1 here is a publicly traded company, involves much less
2 collection risk, whereas the settling defendants involve a
3 significant collection risk, in the trustee's judgment.

4 THE COURT: Mr. Roselius, you have about a minute left
5 of your twelve minutes.

6 MR. ROSELIUS: Okay. Another key consideration is the
7 amount of the settlement. This isn't a nominal settlement, but
8 nine and a half million dollars.

9 And also, keep in mind, the Court dismissed Bombardier
10 entirely. So Bombardier claims it will be left holding the
11 bag, but that only is true if the Court's decision is
12 substantially or entirely overturned on appeal. If that
13 happens, then Bombardier's liability will be much more
14 significant in this court as opposed to what it is now, as
15 things stand today.

16 And also, Judge Gross, the mediator, submitted a
17 declaration -- submitted two declarations confirming the
18 parties' good faith. And I understand he's on the call today,
19 if necessary, if the Court wants to ask any questions. Judge
20 Gross served a full term as a highly esteemed judge on the
21 bankruptcy court for the District of Delaware and is also a
22 highly respected mediator, and you have both of his
23 declarations.

24 In terms of jurisdiction, the Court has related-to
25 jurisdiction for any matter directly or indirectly related to

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

20

1 bankruptcy. And here, these kind of issues would be directly
2 related to any sort of contribution or indemnity claim between
3 Bombardier and the settling defendants.

4 And finally, the bar order is not a de facto third-
5 party release, because I mean, first of all, other courts have
6 approved this. It's not prohibited by Bankruptcy Code Section
7 524(e). That deals with the effect of discharge on claims. It
8 doesn't apply here because the debtor is not getting a
9 discharge.

10 The trustee has never argued that indemnity and
11 contribution claims would be barred by virtue of Section 524,
12 but rather under Section 877.6. And the case that Bombardier
13 cites, which is called Presta, actually makes the same point
14 against them and supports our argument. Thank you, Your Honor.

15 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Roselius. You actually
16 ended up using about all of your fifteen minutes, but I'll give
17 you about a minute or so to respond to Ms. Fornos' argument.

18 Ms. Fornos, are you ready to proceed?

19 MS. FORNOS: Yes, Your Honor. Thank you very much.

20 THE COURT: Thank you.

21 MS. FORNOS: Your Honor, in response to Mr. Roselius'
22 arguments, I think we can frame this into three larger points
23 whether good faith has been satisfied and specifically, whether
24 the Court has or not to make a finding of fact as to good
25 faith.

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

21

1 The second category would be the California law, and
2 we'll explain why. Absolutely, as the Court has found, it is
3 New York law that applies to all the claims that have been
4 brought by the trustee against Bombardier.

5 And we'll address the injunction because although they
6 have proffered that they will amend what has been submitted,
7 the motion that's still pending before the Court is that which
8 was filed and which exceeds the bounds of 877.

9 So starting with the issue of good faith, there's no
10 dispute, Your Honor, it's this Court that has to make a finding
11 under the Tech-Bilt factors. And with all respect to Judge
12 Gross -- he was wonderful, we had the pleasure of meeting
13 him -- his statement on the record that the parties considered
14 Tech-Bilt is insufficient for Bombardier to determine and to
15 establish that that good faith has been made, and it's
16 insufficient, more importantly, for the Court to determine the
17 good faith has been established.

18 And all that the Court needs to do to determine that
19 good faith has not been established and that Bombardier can
20 meet its burden of proof is simply by looking at the admissions
21 that the trustee has made. At page 15 of the reply, at lines
22 19 through 21, the trustee admits it is impossible at this
23 point to determine either the damages that the trustee will
24 recover or the relative liability of the settling defendants
25 and Bombardier. That is an admission that they cannot meet the

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

22

1 very first and most important element of the good-faith
2 analysis under Tech-Bilt, and that's why they're not entitled
3 to the claims bar.

4 And yes, there are other deficiencies. We have no --
5 notwithstanding Mr. Roselius' representations, we have no
6 visibility as to the settling party's financial condition. We
7 have no visibility as to how they intend to allocate the
8 various payments vis-a-vis the two estates. Certainly, we have
9 no visibility as to insurance policy limits.

10 And it's not just us, Your Honor. It's the Court.
11 The California Supreme Court has made clear that this is an
12 issue of fact. And it is the Court's responsibility once a
13 claims bar is put forth to make a finding of fact on this
14 issue.

15 And at the minimum, Your Honor, Bombardier would be
16 entitled to seek discovery on this issue and to peel back the
17 layers that are set forth in the affidavit and declaration
18 that's been submitted by Judge Gross. That's not to say that
19 it's not correct. We just don't have any visibility, and the
20 Court needs to have the sufficient facts to make that finding.

21 As to the issue of California law -- and one other
22 point, Your Honor, on the good faith, which is important. The
23 good faith and 877 is not for the benefit of the settling
24 defendants. It's for the benefit of the nonsettling
25 defendants.

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

23

1 The objective of that analysis that the Court needs to
2 undertake is to preserve the equities. And here, it is
3 Bombardier that is being adversely affected by the claims bar
4 that the trustee seeks to impose upon the nonsettling
5 defendant. And this brings me to the issue of California law
6 and why California law should not apply in this action.

7 The Court has already determined that all claims
8 against Bombardier, these joint tortfeasor claims, are actually
9 governed by New York law. The issue is not, Your Honor, the
10 agreements between Bombardier and Jetcraft. The issue here is
11 the credit allocation of what this claims bar does.

12 The claims bar is in two parts. One, it bars a
13 nonsettling defendant from bringing an action against the
14 settling defendant. But the credit allocation, what a party,
15 the nonsettlor, owes to the debtor in that action is actually
16 governed by the contract between the debtor and Bombardier.
17 It's not governed by the contract that may exist between joint
18 tortfeasors.

19 The credit that will have -- the adverse effect of
20 applying California law in this case to the contractual
21 relations between Bombardier and Zetta are illustrated by
22 simply underscoring that under New York law, Bombardier is
23 entitled to the greater of the full amount of the allocated
24 share of liability to the settling defendants or the amount
25 paid by the settling defendants.

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

24

1 In a hypothetical where a hundred million dollars is
2 found to be at issue, and in a hypothetical here, where nine
3 million dollars is attributable to Jetcraft as the paying -- as
4 the settling defendant, but ninety-nine percent of the
5 liability is attributable to the settling defendant. The only
6 defendant left with viable claims that the Court has not
7 dismissed and the defendant that features prominently
8 throughout the complaint as having actually made allegedly
9 payments, in that analysis, under California law, the only
10 credit that Bombardier would be entitled to, assuming a ninety-
11 nine percentage of liability against Jetcraft, in that case,
12 under the California law, Bombardier would be responsible for
13 ninety-one million dollars because the only credit it can get
14 are the nine million that Jetcraft is settling.

15 But under New York law, we would be entitled to
16 ninety-nine percent credit, meaning only one million is left.
17 The absolute prejudice to Bombardier is illustrated by simply
18 comparing those two statutes. And importantly, Your Honor,
19 it's not just the claims bar. It's the second component. It's
20 the credit to which Bombardier is entitled, and that is an
21 obligation vis-a-vis Bombardier and Zetta. And that is
22 governed by the purchase agreement that Bombardier entered
23 into.

24 Finally, Your Honor, with respect to the injunction,
25 as the Court is aware, a motion was filed and purported to

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

25

1 bind all parties, current defendants and future defendants,
2 against bringing any claims against the settling defendant.
3 Your Honor, there cannot be any clearer action than injunctive
4 relief -- than the trustee seeking injunctive relief to find a
5 whole host of individuals who have not received notice. And
6 although Mr. Roselius has indicated that they're willing to
7 revise these provisions, these provisions have not been filed
8 with the Court. There is nothing on the record that the Court
9 can actually consider by way of a written proposed settlement.

10 Accordingly, Your Honor, in this case, one thing to
11 underscore. If Jetcraft and the trustee want to settle, they
12 can settle. But the minute that they want this Court to adopt
13 a claims bar in a situation where Bombardier is contesting the
14 good faith, that is where the Court needs to consider that
15 either there's enough on the record to confirm that there is a
16 lack of good faith, i.e. admissions, that the trustee cannot
17 satisfy the Tech-Bilt factors because of the rough
18 approximation of plaintiffs' total recovery. They admit they
19 can't (indiscernible) assessment. They admit that they can't
20 make the proportional reliability assessment.

21 This is a matter where the Court must make that
22 finding, and if the Court believes more is needed, then at a
23 minimum, Your Honor, we request discovery on these issues to
24 enable to have an ability to fully assess these issues.

25 THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Fornos.

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

26

1 Mr. Roselius, would you like to respond? You have
2 about a minute.

3 MR. ROSELIUS: Yes, Your Honor.

4 Ms. Fornos made a false statement in that we didn't
5 put anything on the record about the scope of the injunction.
6 It's on page 14 of our reply brief. We state specifically how
7 we would modify it.

8 Whatever credit Bombardier is allowed to get is not
9 affected by Jetcraft getting the benefit of the California
10 statute, which clearly applies to our claims. And there's no
11 cite -- they cite no case otherwise.

12 The hypothetical she talks about will never happen
13 because the only way that type of situation happens is if the
14 case comes back down on appeal and Bombardier is found to be
15 significantly more liable than in the hypothetical.

16 And with respect to whether it's possible to determine
17 proportionate liability, that is not what we said in the brief.
18 The point is that it's impossible to determine with exactitude
19 exactly what the proportionate liability will be without going
20 all the way through trial. Here, the Court's only required to
21 make an educated guess. That's well within the record.

22 The settlement amount is not nominal. It's related to
23 proportionate liability. It's related to the amount of the
24 alleged profits that the settling defendants earned. And it's
25 entirely appropriate. There's no showing here. Bombardier

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

27

1 cannot meet its burden to show a lack of good faith. And it's
2 Bombardier's burden, not the trustee's. Thank you.

3 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Roselius.

4 All right. Mr. Lyons, do you wish -- you have five
5 minutes to address the issues, and solely the issues, that were
6 raised in -- I'll start with CAVIC, and then you can go on to
7 Universal Leaders.

8 So Mr. Lyons.

9 MR. LYONS: Thank you, Your Honor.

10 Well, Your Honor, first of all, Mr. Roselius covered a
11 lot of the points that are raised in CAVIC's joinder. CAVIC's
12 paper adopts a lot of the arguments used by Bombardier, and
13 those have been addressed by Mr. Roselius.

14 CAVIC also addressed that the claims went beyond the
15 scope of 887.6 (sic). Again, that's been addressed by the
16 revised order, which tracks the California statute and does not
17 go beyond that. So we believe that has been addressed.

18 And Your Honor, a more fundamental issue is that the
19 trustee has not alleged tort claims against CAVIC. It hasn't
20 alleged claims in either the Jetcraft action or the CAVIC
21 action. And so CAVIC is -- since they're not alleged to have
22 been tortfeasor, I'm not sure how they have an objection based
23 upon a disproportionate adjudication of liability in the
24 measuring factors, Your Honor, including they make a statement
25 in paragraph 7 that the trustee's seeking more than 200 million

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

28

1 from all defendants and can't show proportionate liability of
2 the settling defendants. Well, Your Honor, CAVIC is not
3 included even in that 200-million-dollar number. The trustee
4 has not alleged tort claims against CAVIC.

5 Your Honor, and fundamentally, again, we submitted the
6 declaration of Judge Gross, who was appointed by Your Honor to
7 conduct a mediation. He conducted that mediation, and he has
8 stated his view on the trustee's and the parties' good faith in
9 reaching that -- in reaching that settlement.

10 So unless Your Honor has any questions, I believe that
11 addresses the points raised in CAVIC's opposition.

12 THE COURT: Thank you. Mr. Lyons, just one point of
13 clarification. I'm not sure that I appointed Judge Gross. I
14 authorized the parties to go to mediation, but I certainly
15 didn't select Judge Gross. That was a mutual agreement between
16 the trustee and the defendants. I just wanted --

17 MR. LYONS: Right.

18 THE COURT: -- to clarify that. Correct, Mr. Lyons?

19 MR. LYONS: Yes, correct. You didn't --

20 THE COURT: Okay.

21 MR. LYONS: -- appoint him but approved his services
22 as a mediator --

23 THE COURT: Correct --

24 MR. LYONS: -- (indiscernible).

25 THE COURT: -- I approved payment of his fees, but I

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

29

1 certainly didn't say you have to go to Judge Gross or go to any
2 other mediator. I just said I thought that the case would
3 definitely benefit from mediation.

4 MR. LYONS: Correct, Your Honor.

5 THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

6 And Ms. Azlin, would you like to be heard?

7 MS. AZLIN: Yes, Your Honor. I will try not to repeat
8 most of the arguments that were addressed by Ms. Fornos, other
9 than to say that CALI, as Mr. Lyons recognized, joined in most
10 of the arguments by Bombardier and urges this Court to deny the
11 current motion to approve the Jetcraft settlement for the
12 reasons set forth in the underlying documents.

13 I do want to emphasize one point, and that is first,
14 Your Honor, as you know, CALI is not a party and never has been
15 properly made a party to the adversary proceeding. And as
16 such, we believe that CALI would be unfairly prejudiced by the
17 scope and nature of the current order sought by the trustee and
18 the settling parties to that case.

19 And on this issue, Your Honor, Mr. Lyons just put his
20 finger on, in fact, the exact issue that we find problematic
21 here, and that is that, again, CALI is not a party to the
22 Jetcraft adversary proceeding itself. As Your Honor knows, the
23 trustee attempted to belatedly add CALI to that case. That
24 effort was rejected because, among other reasons, the claims
25 that the trustee sought to add CALI to were barred by the

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

30

1 applicable statute of limitations.

2 Despite the fact that CALI's not a party to that case,
3 we believe that the trustee is seeking to do here that which it
4 would not be allowed to do and in fact would not be effective
5 had the motion for a good-faith settlement determination been
6 properly filed in that adversary proceeding as we believe it
7 ought to have been.

8 The terms of the California statute is clear. We
9 believe it provides in relevant part that, "Any party to an
10 action in which it is alleged that two or more parties are
11 joint tortfeasors or coobligors on a contract debt shall be
12 entitled to a hearing on the issue of the good faith of a
13 settlement entered into by the plaintiff or other claimant and
14 one or more of the alleged joint tortfeasors or coobligors.

15 Your Honor, again, CALI is not alleged in this action,
16 where the trustee has purported to file this motion ,or any
17 other to be an alleged joint tortfeasor or coobligor with any
18 of the settling Jetcraft defendants, nor does it believe that
19 it has any such coliability. And so we believe that the scope
20 of the relief sought by the trustee and the settling defendants
21 as set forth in the settlement agreement is just patently
22 overbroad.

23 Your Honor, the trustee now attempts to pretend that
24 the 877 order sought and the request for injunction in the
25 pending motion are one and the same. We believe that the

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

31

1 settlement agreement is clear on this issue, as was the
2 original proposed order sought by the trustee, and that
3 settlement agreement, again, upon which the entire settlement
4 is expressly contingent, right, is clear. And in the section
5 of the settlement agreement governing the Rule 9019 approval
6 order that the trustee was to seek here had two different
7 sections.

8 Section C required the trustee to seek an order making
9 all necessary findings and concluding that the settlement is in
10 good faith pursuant to California Code of Procedure 877.6. And
11 section D requires that the trustee seek an order -- and again,
12 the entire settlement is contingent upon this -- ordering that,
13 "All the parties to the Chapter 7 cases and all current or
14 future defendants in the litigation are barred, enjoined, and
15 prohibited from seeking contribution or indemnity in any
16 respect from the settling defendants on account of claims
17 asserted in the litigation."

18 Now, this is actually in the terms of the settlement
19 agreement itself, and despite Mr. Lyons' and Mr. Roselius'
20 statements to the Court today that they intend to submit a
21 revised proposed order, that is not what the settling
22 defendants and the trustee agreed to in the settlement
23 agreement itself, again, which is contingent upon this Court
24 issuing an order that hits those two points. We believe that
25 these are two different types of relief sought, section C and

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

32

1 section D, one being the 877 potential order and one being the
2 claims bar. We believe that those are governed by different
3 substantive and procedural rules.

4 To the extent, Your Honor, that the trustee only seeks
5 the protection of Section 877.6 of the California Code of
6 Procedure, we believe that the parties were required to file
7 the proper motion under that statute in the Jetcraft adversary
8 proceeding itself, where it would be limited in its impact and
9 effect on the parties to that proceeding and the alleged joint
10 tortfeasors and coobligors, if any, to that proceeding.

11 And again, this is if they can meet the underlying
12 Tech-Bilt factors, which with again, all due respect to the
13 parties' statements on this issue, regardless of whether or not
14 the settling parties actually "considered" those factors in
15 reaching the settlement here, we don't think that they've made
16 the necessary presentation that would enable this Court to make
17 those findings. And specifically, we echo Bombardier's
18 concerns in regards to the proportionality factor aspect when
19 coming from the position of CALI, which is an alleged, I would
20 say, we believe, an innocent bystander to much of the wrongs
21 alleged here.

22 Whereas on the face of the trustee's complaint in the
23 Jetcraft adversary itself, it makes clear that the very
24 settling parties at issue here are amongst the parties that the
25 trustee himself has contended committed the vast majority of

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

33

1 the underlying wrongdoing.

2 THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Azlin.

3 Mr. Lyons, if you'd like to respond for a minute or
4 two, you didn't use your whole time. And Ms. Azlin did go over
5 a bit, although I didn't cut her off.

6 MR. LYONS: Yes, Your Honor.

7 Again, the proposed order that we're submitting is by
8 the agreement of both Jetcraft and the trustee, subject, of
9 course, to Your Honor's approval. And we believe that tracks
10 the statute.

11 And I invite Mr. Ciatti to weigh in on that if he
12 could take thirty seconds of that extra minute just to confirm
13 that.

14 THE COURT: Certainly. Is there anything else, Mr.
15 Lyons, though, because I'll then turn to your argument
16 regarding Universal Leader?

17 MR. LYONS: Nothing further from me, Your Honor.

18 THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Ciatti, did you wish to be
19 heard, just on that specific issue?

20 MR. CIATTI: Good morning, Your Honor. Michael Ciatti
21 on behalf of the Jetcraft and FK defendants.

22 Just to confirm what we put in our consent that we
23 would agree to the modification of the order as proposed by the
24 trustee and consider that to be compliant with the settlement
25 agreement that Ms. Azlin referred to.

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

34

1 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Ciatti.

2 All right. Mr. Lyons, turning to the issues raised by
3 Universal Leader, if you'd please address those.

4 MR. LYONS: Yes, thank you, Your Honor. And I think
5 these issues are fairly straightforward. I think we've
6 discussed these issues about estate allocation in a lot of
7 detail, and it certainly is going to come up in the cash-
8 management -- or the cash-budget motion as well.

9 Your Honor, right now this is a lawsuit brought by
10 both of the estates. Certainly, we are not in any way taking a
11 position on ultimately whether the estate should be
12 substantively consolidated. We settled both these claims.
13 Ultimately, at the point in time when the trustee proposes a
14 plan of liquidation or an interim distribution, the allocation
15 issues will be then -- will then be relevant. And at that
16 point, we may well decide to seek subsequent consolidation or
17 some other allocation.

18 But right now, it's about bringing the money in the
19 door is what the purpose of this settlement is. And
20 ultimately, it's subject to every parties rights, including Mr.
21 Bernstein's clients, to object to the ultimate disbursement and
22 the allocation of how these proceeds should be, if they should
23 be, distinguished between the estates. But it's just premature
24 right now, Your Honor, and shouldn't in any way impede approval
25 of the settlement.

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

35

1 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Lyons.

2 Mr. Bernstein.

3 MR. BERNSTEIN: Thank you, Your Honor. Again, for the
4 record, Michael Bernstein of Arnold & Porter for Universal and
5 Glove.

6 So as Mr. Lyons said and as Your Honor knows, our
7 objection raised the issue of there being two separate
8 bankruptcy estates in the absence of any evidence as to which
9 of those two separate estates owns these claims and therefore
10 should benefit from the settlement if it's approved. As the
11 Court knows, the trustee has in some context in the past
12 treated the estate as if they were one, as if they had been
13 consolidated. And we have raised this issue before about there
14 being two separate estates with separate assets and separate
15 creditors.

16 With that said, I want to do two things here. One is
17 respond briefly to the arguments that Mr. Lyons' made in his
18 reply brief for today and then to offer a solution that would
19 address at least a bar issue that the Court could consider.

20 So Mr. Lyons basically made -- the trustee basically
21 made in his reply brief three arguments. One is he said that
22 the Chapter 11 cash management order allows him to put all of
23 the cash in one of the Chapter 7 debtors' estates. The second
24 is he said both debtors owned Jetcraft claims. And third is he
25 said, today and in his brief, that we can reallocate it

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

36

1 sometime down the road if necessary as between the two debtors.

2 So on the first issue, as this Court recognized when
3 the trustee made almost exactly the same argument in the
4 context of the fee-application objection, and Your Honor then
5 took a recess to go review the Chapter 11 cash-management
6 order, the trustee is simply wrong. The Chapter 11 cash-
7 management order has no application to the issues in the
8 Chapter 7 cases that we're dealing with now.

9 That order dealt with ordinary-course operational
10 issues in the Chapter 11 cases. It authorized money to be
11 taken from a DIP account, the DIP operating account, and put
12 into two separate accounts, one for payroll and one for
13 nonpayroll ordinary-course operating expenses. And then it
14 dealt with compliance with various U.S. Trustee guidelines
15 governing debtor-in-possession accounts. It certainly did not
16 authorize a Chapter 7 trustee in future Chapter 7 cases, a
17 trustee that didn't even exist in that capacity at that time,
18 to comingle the assets of two separate Chapter 7 estates.

19 Second, with respect to Mr. Lyons' comments in his
20 brief and today that both debtors own the Jetcraft claims
21 because the trustee loosely referred to the debtors
22 collectively in the adversary complaint without distinguishing
23 between them, that's just not good enough. Determining which
24 of the two estates owns the claims or whether both of them own
25 them in some way requires evidence. Among other things, it

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

37

1 requires looking at the underlying transactions and the
2 transaction documents that formed the basis for the Jetcraft
3 claims to see what interest, if any, each of the two debtors
4 might have in those claims.

5 And if the trustee continues to take the position that
6 both of the debtors owned an interest in the claims, he needs
7 to present evidence to substantiate that assertion, and he
8 would need to propose an allocation as between the two,
9 because, of course, even if both of them own the claims, that
10 doesn't mean it's 50/50, and he would need to present evidence
11 to demonstrate that his allocation is reflective of reality and
12 not arbitrary because otherwise, you could give one estate and
13 its creditors a windfall at the expense of the others. But of
14 course, the trustee hasn't done any of this, and it's critical
15 because there are separate estates with separate creditors,
16 including our client.

17 Finally, the idea that we can figure this all down the
18 road, the kick-the-can-down-the-road approach, doesn't work
19 without some important protections, at least, because it is
20 entirely possible that if Your Honor were at some point in the
21 future to order a reallocation, the obligor estate, if you
22 will, would not have sufficient resources to make the obligee
23 estate whole. So it's not something we can kick down the
24 road -- kick that down the road.

25 But that does lead me to a suggestion that Your Honor

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

38

1 might consider that would reconcile the trustee's desire to get
2 some dollars in the door with our, I think, very legitimate
3 concern that each of the respective estates and their creditors
4 be treated fairly, and that is this. If the Court is inclined
5 to approve the settlement, notwithstanding the other objections
6 that have been raised, it could, and we respectfully submit
7 should, include in the settlement order a provision that says
8 these settlement proceeds will be held in a separate,
9 segregated account and will not be spent on anything, on
10 allowed administrative expenses or anything else, until such
11 time as this Court has entered a final order, either
12 substantively consolidating the estates or in the alternative,
13 determining who owns these dollars.

14 That would have the effect of getting the dollars in
15 the door as the trustee wants, but it would do so without
16 prejudicing either estate and without prejudicing the creditors
17 of a particular estate. Unless Your Honor has any questions
18 about our position, that's all I have to say.

19 THE COURT: I do not. Thank you, Mr. Bernstein.

20 Mr. Lyons, is there anything you'd like to respond to
21 regarding Mr. Bernstein's comments?

22 MR. LYONS: Your Honor, just very briefly, every
23 dollar we spend is subject to Your Honor's approval. Any party
24 can object. If there needs to be money spent, we're going to
25 be talking about the budget motion. So everything is fully

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

39

1 transparent. We have a detailed listing of all of the
2 expenditures.

3 Nothing in putting this these funds into a single
4 account prejudices any creditors to the ultimate allocation of
5 these resources. It is for administrative convenience. It was
6 a single DIP account that was established for, really,
7 administrative purposes. And certainly, the trustee's taken no
8 position that this somehow results in a de facto substantive
9 consolidation.

10 All parties will have an opportunity to look at post-
11 allocation at the time when distributions are made, Your Honor.
12 And so we have accounting and all the -- the main receipts,
13 Your Honor, have been the adversary actions, and everybody that
14 has full visibility, the debt structure, the coliability of the
15 debtors under all these -- under all these different documents.

16 So it's something, Your Honor, that I think is not
17 prejudicial in any way. And Your Honor, certainly nothing will
18 be spent without Your Honor's approval.

19 THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

20 I want to take a look at a couple of things that were
21 addressed in the argument. It's now about 10:20 here. We'll
22 be in recess till 10:45. At that point, I will rule on this
23 motion, and then I'll proceed with the other motions that are
24 on calendar as well. So we'll be off the record for about
25 twenty-five minutes until 10:45.

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

40

1 (Recess from 10:20 a.m., until 10:48 a.m.)

2 THE COURT: All right. Good morning, again. This is
3 Judge Klein. We're back on the record in matter number 11 in
4 the Zetta Jet case.

5 Just so everybody has the roadmap of how the rest of
6 the day is going to go, I'll rule on the 9019 motion. That
7 will probably take us right up to lunchtime on the West Coast.
8 We'll take a lunchtime break. Then we'll all come back, and
9 I'll address all of the other matters on calendar.

10 So as I mentioned, I wanted to look at a few things.
11 The argument was very helpful. I appreciate hearing from both
12 sides, and I'm ready to rule now on the 9019 motion.

13 So before the Court is a motion for order approving
14 settlement agreement by and among the Chapter 7 trustee and the
15 various Jetcraft entities and the various FK entities. In
16 support of the motion, Jonathan King, the Chapter 7 trustee of
17 Zetta Jet USA and Zetta Jet PTE, which we refer to as Zetta
18 Singapore, filed a declaration.

19 On November 29th, retired bankruptcy Judge Kevin
20 Gross, who mediated the dispute, filed a report. Bombardier
21 and its related entities filed an opposition to the motion.
22 CAVIC filed an opposition as well. And Universal Leader and
23 Glove Assets filed a limited objection.

24 On January 11th, the trustee filed a reply in support
25 of the motion, and the trustee also filed a mediator statement.

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

41

1 That was on January 11th. The FK defendants and the Jetcraft
2 defendants filed a notice of consent to modify proposed order
3 and joinder in reply.

4 The history of this case is well set out in the
5 numerous written and oral rulings. Suffice it to say that
6 Zetta USA and Zetta Singapore filed Chapter 11 petitions in
7 2017. Mr. King was appointed as the Chapter 11 trustee, and
8 then after the cases were converted, he was appointed as the 7
9 trustee.

10 Jetcraft Corp. filed a 91,062.26 unsecured proof of
11 claim in the Zetta Singapore case. On 9/13, the trustee filed
12 an adversary complaint against Jetcraft and numerous other
13 entities. There was a settlement with Element Aviation and
14 ECN. There were two rounds of motions to dismiss. The most
15 recent was motions to dismiss the first amended complaint, and
16 that complaint was filed on January 28th, '21.

17 The Court granted Bombardier and its related entities'
18 motion to dismiss the first amended complaint without leave to
19 amend. The Court granted in part and denied in part the FK
20 defendants' motion to dismiss the first amended complaint
21 without leave to amend. And the Court granted in part and
22 denied in part the Jetcraft entities' motion to dismiss the
23 first amended complaint with prejudice.

24 On 9/7, the Court -- 9/7 of last year, the Court
25 entered an order granting the Bombardier entities' motion for

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

42

1 entry of a final judgment.

2 Turning to the arguments, the trustee seeks approval
3 of a settlement agreement with the FK and Jetcraft defendants,
4 who I call the settling defendants, under 105 and FRBP 9019.
5 According to the trustee, the settling defendants and he
6 engaged in mediation conducted by retired Judge Gross,
7 resulting in a settlement that provides the following.

8 The settling defendants will pay the trustee 9.5
9 million in two equal payments, the first within three business
10 days after an order approving the motion becomes final and
11 nonappealable, and the second, no later than July 10th of this
12 year. If the settling defendants fail to make the second
13 payment and fail to cure within thirty days, the trustee may
14 either obtain a 4.75-million-dollar consent judgment and a one-
15 million-dollar penalty plus interest, or retain the first
16 installment and resume litigating against the settling
17 defendants.

18 The second part of the settlement is that Jetcraft
19 Corp. will withdraw its proof of claim, number 17.1.

20 The third provision, or third substantive part of the
21 settlement, is within three business days after the trustee
22 receives the second installment. He will dismiss all claims
23 pending against the settling defendants.

24 Next, the trustee and the settling defendants will
25 mutually release each other from all claims. Next, all parties

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

43

1 to the Chapter 7 case and all current or future defendants in
2 the litigation will be barred, enjoined, and prohibited from
3 seeking contribution or indemnity in any respect from the
4 settling defendants. That's called the claims bar. If a
5 nonsettling party violates the claims bar, the trustee will
6 cooperate with the settling defendants to enforce the bar.

7 Finally, the trustee will file an approval order,
8 which is defined as an order granting the motion that the
9 trustee seeks from the Court, in a case that's currently
10 pending in the Superior Court Province of Quebec, District of
11 Montreal.

12 The trustee argues that in the Ninth Circuit, courts
13 consider the following factors to determine whether to approve
14 a settlement: The probability of success in litigation,
15 expected difficulties, if any, in the matter of collection; the
16 complexity, expenses, inconvenience and delay related to the
17 litigation; and finally, the paramount interests of the
18 creditors. The trustee contends that each of these factors
19 weighs in favor of the Court granting the motion.

20 He expresses confidence that the adversary proceeding
21 would be successful, however, due to the complexity of the
22 issues involved, he concedes that success is uncertain. He
23 highlights that the settling time-consuming and burdensome
24 litigation is encouraged. He asserts that collecting a future
25 judgment from the settling defendants would be challenging

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

44

1 because several of them are based in foreign countries, which
2 would require the trustee to navigate foreign laws while
3 incurring significant costs.

4 He argues that the complexity, expense, inconvenience
5 and potential delay of continuing litigation all weigh heavily
6 in favor of approving the settlement. He claims that the
7 settlement agreement is in the paramount interest of creditors
8 because it provides the maximum possible recovery in the
9 shortest amount of time. According to the trustee, California
10 law applies because the litigation was initiated, prosecuted,
11 and ultimately settled in California concerning a California
12 entity.

13 The trustee argues that a release given in good faith
14 against one codefendant shall not discharge any other such
15 party from liability unless its terms so provide, but it does
16 discharge the party to whom it is given from all liability for
17 any contribution to any other parties, citing Cal. Civil
18 Procedure Code 866 and 877(b). He asserts that when a court
19 determines a settlement was executed in good faith, other
20 tortfeasors are barred from any future claims against the
21 settling tortfeasor or coobligor for equitable comparative
22 contribution or partial or comparative indemnity based on
23 comparative negligence or comparative fault. The trustee
24 contends that under California law, courts consider a number of
25 factors to determine whether a settlement was executed in good

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

45

1 faith. I'll call those the good-faith factors, which are
2 announced in Tech-Bilt, 38 Cal.3d 488, 1985.

3 He similarly asserts that the settlement agreement
4 satisfies the good-faith factors because while the settling
5 defendants liability exceeds the 9.5-million-dollar settlement,
6 it is recognized that a settlor should pay less in a settlement
7 than it would have if found liable after trial. The trustee
8 acknowledges that it is uncertain whether he will be successful
9 litigating claims against the settling defendants or the other
10 defendants, and the amount of the settlement agreement is fair
11 in light of the strengths and weaknesses of the trustee's
12 claim, the expense and delay of litigation, and the risks
13 attendant to all litigation. He concludes there's no collusion
14 or fraud. The settlement agreement is the result of good-faith
15 mediation.

16 Bombardier and its related entities argue that the
17 motion and settlement agreement seeks relief beyond the scope
18 of this Court's authority. BAC acknowledges that they do not
19 take issue with a negotiated agreement between the trustee and
20 the settling defendants, providing that the resolution is
21 limited to the claims involving those parties only. They do,
22 however, take issue with the overbroad, overreaching, and
23 unsupportive relief required by the settlement agreement and
24 sought by the motion.

25 BAC and related entities assert that the motion seeks

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

46

1 injunctive relief but bypasses FRBP 7001(7), which requires
2 that injunctions be sought by complaint. BAC and the related
3 entities note that courts have been near universal in reversing
4 injunctions which have been issued without complying with Rule
5 7001. According to BAC, courts have likewise denied injunctive
6 relief when embedded in settlement motions for failing to be
7 brought via an adversary proceeding.

8 BAC argued that the trustee failed to provide
9 Constitutionally-required notice to all parties, who he
10 attempts to bind by the terms of the settlement agreement.
11 They highlight that there were 459 proofs of claim filed in the
12 Chapter 7 cases, but notice of the motion was only provided to
13 about 100 entities, and providing notice calculated to reach
14 potentially-affected parties is a fundamental tenet of due
15 process, which has not occurred here.

16 They assert that the order limiting notice that was
17 entered by the Court early in the Chapter 11 cases could not
18 conceivably apply to a request to enjoin every party-in-
19 interest in these cases, and it could not apply to any
20 adversary proceeding where the FRBP-specific notice, summons,
21 and service requirements are applicable. They contend that
22 even if the Court were to address the merits of the motion, the
23 claims bar, which is based on California law, cannot bind them
24 or any nonparties to the settlement.

25 They contend that the claims bar cannot possibly apply

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

47

1 to them because they're not parties to the settlement
2 agreement, did not participate in its negotiations, and did not
3 agree to the California choice of law or inclusion of the
4 claims bar. They argue that the trustee's reliance on Nucorp,
5 a nonbankruptcy case which applied California's choice-of-law
6 test to determine substantive law is misplaced because
7 bankruptcy courts in the Ninth Circuit apply the Restatement
8 (Second) of Conflicts of Law to determine substantive law.

9 They highlight that the settlement agreement involves
10 the same tort claims that were alleged against them in the
11 first amended complaint. They note that the Court previously
12 rejected the trustee's argument that California law applies to
13 these claims against BAC and its related entities, finding
14 instead that based on the Zetta-BAC asset purchase agreements,
15 New York law applied to all tort claims against BAC and its
16 related entities.

17 They argue that the APA's broad choice-of-law
18 provisions also encompass their contribution claims. They
19 argue that in contrast to California law, New York law provides
20 that when a joint tortfeasor settles, the plaintiff's claims
21 against the nonsettling tortfeasors are reduced to the extent
22 of any amount stipulated by the release or in the amount of the
23 released tortfeasor's equitable share of the damages, whichever
24 is greater.

25 BAC and its related entities contend that under New

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

48

1 York law, the trustee cannot recover from them more than their
2 equitable share of damages because his claims will be reduced
3 by the greater of Jetcraft and FK defendants' relative share of
4 fault or amount paid. They argue that even if California law
5 were to apply, the claims bar exceeds the scope of Cal. Civil
6 Procedure Code 877 and 877.6. They highlight that the claims
7 bar would bar, enjoin, restrain, and extinguish any claim they
8 or any person has against the settling defendants, even claims
9 not based on comparative fault.

10 They note that the trustee seeks a good-faith finding
11 that purportedly satisfies the California contribution bar
12 statute, but they claim that the trustee is overreaching,
13 because 877 and 877.6 apply only to claims based on comparative
14 contribution, comparative negligence, or comparative fault and
15 concern only equitable indemnification, not contractual
16 indemnification. BAC and its related entities assert that even
17 if the relief requested were limited to what is authorized
18 under California law, the motion does not support a good-faith
19 finding because it does not establish that the settlement
20 agreement accounts for the settling defendants' proportionate
21 liability for the total amount of the trustee's approximate
22 recovery.

23 According to BAC and its related entities, the trustee
24 glosses over and misapplies the proportionality factor, which
25 is one of the most important ways that a court determines good

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

49

1 faith. They contend that the Court cannot make a good-faith
2 finding here because there's no substantial evidence to support
3 a critical assumption as to the nature and extent of the
4 settling defendants' proportional liability. And they assert
5 that the trustee's apparent exclusive reliance on the November
6 29th mediators' report fails because Tech-Bilt requires more.

7 They contend that a bankruptcy court does not have
8 jurisdiction to effectuate a claims bar regarding claims
9 between nondebtor parties that do not affect the debtor's
10 estate. The claims bar requested by the trustee exceeds this
11 Court's jurisdiction, BAC and its related entities assert,
12 because it bars all claims, including direct actions that
13 cannot be estate property. They highlight that settlement
14 agreements barring all actions exceed a bankruptcy court's
15 related-to jurisdiction.

16 Finally, BAC and its related entities argue that the
17 settlement agreement also would operate as a de facto third-
18 party release, which is contrary to Ninth Circuit law. They
19 contend that the Ninth Circuit historically and categorically
20 has had that there is no authority to restrain third parties
21 from pursuing independent claims like contribution,
22 reimbursement, or contractual indemnity by nondebtors against
23 other nondebtors. BAC and its related entities recognize that
24 in Blixseth, the Ninth Circuit arguably narrowed the complete
25 prohibition on third-party releases, but they assert that

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

50

1 neither of the conditions that led to that decision are present
2 here.

3 BAC requests that the Court deny the motion in its
4 entirety, or if the Court decides to reach the merits, to
5 schedule a further evidentiary hearing to provide BAC and its
6 related entities time to conduct discovery.

7 CAVIC adopts and incorporates by reference the BAC and
8 its related entities' opposition. It also notes that the
9 trustee seeks more than 200 million in damages from all
10 defendants, but he has not and cannot show that the
11 proportionate liability of the settling defendants is only 9.5
12 million, and nothing in the November 29th mediator's report
13 provides a rough approximation of the trustee's total recovery
14 and the settling defendants' proportionate liability.

15 Universal Leader and Glove note that in addition to
16 the procedural and substantive objections raised by Bombardier
17 and CAVIC, the trustee seeks approval of the settlement
18 agreement on behalf of both the Zetta USA and Zetta Singapore
19 estates, without identifying which estate owns the claims and
20 causes of action being settled and without allocating the
21 settlement or proceeds therefrom between each estate. They
22 highlight that the trustee treats the two estates as if they
23 have been substantively consolidated, but they have not.

24 Universal Leader and Glove conclude that the trustee
25 must show which of those two estates owns the claims and causes

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

51

1 of action that he proposes to settle with competent evidence.
2 And he must then ensure that the proceeds are deposited into
3 that estate's account and used only for the benefit of that
4 estate and its creditors.

5 In the reply, the trustee asserts that the relief
6 requested in the motion is within the bounds of ordinary good-
7 faith settlements. He argues that California courts routinely
8 grant relief under Cal. Civil Procedure Code 877.6, discharging
9 settling defendants from any liability for contribution or
10 indemnity to any other alleged tortfeasor.

11 He refutes Bombardier's assertion that the claims bar
12 is an injunction that requires the mechanism of an adversary
13 proceeding. Instead, he contends that the claims bar seeks a
14 statutory litigation bar under 877.6 as part of a settlement
15 agreement, which is appropriately sought via a 9019 motion. To
16 support his position that a separate adversary proceeding is
17 unnecessary, he cites Hartog, a Southern District of Florida
18 case, Land Resource, a Middle District of Florida case, Estate
19 of Jackson, a Middle District of Florida case, Superior Homes,
20 an Eleventh Circuit unpublished case, and In re: Munford, an
21 Eleventh District published case.

22 The trustee notes that he is not seeking a finding
23 that 105 provides a substantive basis for a bar order, but
24 rather that it provides a procedural vehicle for applying 877.6
25 through a 9019 motion rather than an adversary proceeding. The

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

52

1 trustee acknowledges that a claims bar and an injunction both
2 have the effect of precluding specified conduct, but he states
3 they are different remedies governed by different procedures
4 emanating from different sources of authority. He highlights
5 that a California statutory bar is governed by the Tech-Bilt
6 good-faith factors, and injunctions are governed by FRBP 65.

7 The trustee argues that the BAC's reliance on Zale
8 Corp., a Fifth Circuit 1995 case, is misplaced because the
9 injunction in Zale was based on FRCP 65, not a separate statute
10 like 877.6. He contends that subsequent cases from within the
11 Fifth Circuit have entered injunctions without requiring an
12 adversary proceeding, citing Mirant, a 2005 Northern District
13 of Texas case. According to the trustee, the FRBP 9019
14 standard is more exacting because the movant has the burden of
15 proof, whereas under 877.6, the burden is on the challenger.
16 Therefore, the trustee asserts, if a court approves a
17 settlement under FRBP 9019, a good-faith finding under the
18 less-stringent 877.6 standard flows.

19 The trustee argues that because BAC and the settling
20 defendants are actively involved in the Jetcraft AP, there is
21 no need to file an additional adversary proceeding. He
22 recognizes BAC's concerns regarding a lack of notice to parties
23 not served with a copy of the settlement agreement. He
24 contends that this objection can be addressed by reducing the
25 scope of the bar order to include only those parties served

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

53

1 with notice, as established by the trustee's certificate of
2 service. The trustee proposes draft language addressing this
3 issue and claims that with the revisions, no party will be
4 subject to the bar order without first receiving notice.

5 Regarding the applicable law governing the settlement
6 agreement, the trustee alleges that the Court has already
7 determined that California law applies to the substantive
8 claims against the settling defendants. California law also
9 applies to indemnity contribution claims arising from those
10 claims, and it's appropriate that they be afforded the
11 protections of 877.6.

12 The trustee contends that he and the settling
13 defendants appropriately chose California law to govern the
14 settlement because the trustee's tort claims were initiated,
15 prosecuted, and ultimately settled in California, and the
16 claims concern a California entity, Zetta Jet USA. He
17 discounts BAC's conclusory assertion that New York law would
18 govern any potential contribution action, alleging that the
19 Court ruled that New York law applied to the trustee's claims
20 against BAC based on the APA's.

21 The trustee asserts that numerous courts have held
22 that California law would apply to a contribution or indemnity
23 claim arising out of California claims, similar to the claims
24 asserted against the settling defendants. The trustee explains
25 that the claims bar seeks nothing more than to have the

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

54

1 protections of 877.6 apply. But to the extent that a broader
2 interpretation could be inferred from the order authorized in
3 Allstate, that's 214 WL 12621185, District of Arizona, 2014,
4 the modified proposed order has been reworked to clarify that
5 it only applies to equitable comparative contribution or
6 partial or comparative indemnity based on a comparative
7 negligence or comparative fault, which resolves BAC's and its
8 entities' concern about a more expansive interpretation.

9 The trustee maintains that the settlement agreement
10 satisfies the Tech-Bilt good-faith factors. He rejects BAC's
11 argument that there is not enough evidence to support such a
12 finding. He asserts that a finding of good faith may be
13 challenged only when the settlement is grossly disproportionate
14 to what a reasonable person at the time of the settlement would
15 estimate the settling parties' liability to be.

16 He argues that BAC places too much emphasis on the
17 proportionate liability factor, and in fact, a court is not
18 required to determine approximate liability with precision, but
19 an educated guess is sufficient. He contends that BAC
20 completely discounts the November 29th mediator's report and
21 the January 11th mediator's statement.

22 The trustee highlights cases where courts have
23 approved settlements with a significant discrepancy between the
24 alleged damages and the settlement amount. The trustee
25 contends that this Court has related-to jurisdiction to enter

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

55

1 the claims-bar order because in the Ninth Circuit, bankruptcy
2 courts have jurisdiction over any matter that could have a
3 conceivable impact on the estate. The trustee argues that the
4 claims bar has a conceivable impact on the estate because the
5 settlement agreement will provide significant funds to the
6 estate.

7 He highlights Munford, an Eleventh Circuit case, and
8 argues that the Eleventh Circuit found the nexus between the
9 claims of the nonsettling defendants against the settling
10 defendants was sufficiently close to the proposed settlement
11 agreement to confer related-to jurisdiction on the bankruptcy
12 court. The trustee contends that absent the prohibition
13 against indemnity claims as provided under 877.6, the settling
14 defendants would be unwilling to settle without holding back
15 funds to defend against potential future claims, and the estate
16 would be negatively affected by receiving less money.

17 The trustee argues that any of the BAC's barred claims
18 against the settling defendants are inextricably intertwined
19 with the claims the trustee asserts against the settling
20 defendant. And he contends that as comparative claims, they
21 were properly and automatically barred under California law if
22 the Court makes a good-faith finding. The trustee contends
23 that In re: Archer, a case from the Northern District of Ohio,
24 supports his position rather than BAC's because it involved a
25 bar order that enjoined any person from future claims, versus a

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

56

1 claims bar applicable only to nonsettling defendants, which is
2 at issue here.

3 The trustee disputes BAC's assertion that the claims
4 bar is the functional equivalent of a third-party release. He
5 contends that the authority for the claims bar rests in Cal.
6 Civil Procedure Code 877.6, nor in 524 of the Bankruptcy Code.
7 He asserts that BAC is blurring the lines between a prohibited
8 all-persons third-party release and a statutory contribution
9 order of the type approved by courts in *Munford and Hartog*.

10 The trustee contends that CAVIC's opposition should be
11 overruled, and Universal Leader-Gloves' opposition is without
12 merit.

13 Turning to the legal standard, FRBP 9019 provides that
14 on motion by a trustee and after notice in a hearing, the Court
15 may approve a compromise or a settlement. A bankruptcy court
16 has great latitude in approving compromise agreements. The
17 Court's discretion, however, is not unlimited. A bankruptcy
18 court should approve a settlement if it was the result of good-
19 faith negotiations and is fair and equitable. That's *In re: a*
20 *C Properties*, 784 F.2d 1377 (9th Cir. 1986).

21 When determining whether a proposed settlement
22 agreement is fair and equitable, courts must consider, one, the
23 probability of success in the litigation, two, the
24 difficulties, if any, to be encountered in the matter of
25 collection, three, the complexity of the litigation involved

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

57

1 and the expense, inconvenience, and delay necessarily attending
2 it, and four, the paramount interests of the creditors and a
3 proper deference to their reasonable views in the premises.
4 The trustee has the burden of demonstrating that the compromise
5 is fair and equitable and should be approved.

6 A settlement may be approved if it is fair and
7 equitable when comparing the claims being compromised against
8 the likely rewards of litigation. Further, when assessing a
9 compromise, courts need not rule upon the disputed facts and
10 questions of law, but rather must only canvass the issues.
11 When analyzing proposed settlement, the Court should not
12 substitute its judgment for that of the trustee. Instead, the
13 Court must determine whether the settlement falls below the
14 lowest point in the range of reasonableness.

15 While the Court should consider the reasonable view of
16 creditors, objections do not rule. It is well-established that
17 compromises are favored in bankruptcy. As noted by the Supreme
18 Court in administering reorganization proceedings in an
19 economical and practical manner will often be wise to arrange
20 the settlement of claims as to which there are substantial and
21 reasonable doubts.

22 In terms of the analysis, the first issue the Court
23 will address is whether or not the settlement agreement can be
24 approved via 9019 motion or required a separate adversary. In
25 the motion, the trustee did not address FRBP 7001's requirement

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

58

1 or whether the relief requested can be obtained via motion or
2 requires an adversary proceeding.

3 In the opposition, BAC assert that FRBP 7001(7)
4 mandates that injunctive relief be sought via complaint, a
5 requirement the trustee cannot avoid by embedding the relief in
6 a 9019 motion. They contend that courts have denied injunctive
7 relief included in settlement agreements due to a failure to
8 satisfy Rule 7001's procedural requirements. BAC state that
9 the trustee's attempt to obtain an injunction by filing a
10 motion rather than initiating an adversary proceeding is a
11 fatal flaw that precludes the Court from granting the relief
12 requested.

13 In the reply, the trustee argues that the Court can
14 grant the requested relief without a separate adversary
15 proceeding because he is not seeking an FRCP 65 injunction
16 under the Court's equitable powers to maintain the status quo
17 pending the outcome of a new legal dispute. Rather, he claims
18 he is seeking an order approving a statutory bar against
19 contribution and indemnity claims by joint tortfeasors as part
20 of a settlement agreement under FRBP 9019.

21 He asserts that BAC's arguments regarding FRBP 7001(7)
22 do not account for the specific context of a bar order included
23 in a 9019 motion, and he advances four reasons why Rule 7001(7)
24 is inapplicable. One, Courts have entered settlement bar
25 provisions in 9019 settlements under FRBP 7016(c)(2), 11 U.S.C.

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

59

1 105, and the All Writs Act. Two, approval under FRBP 9019 is
2 effectively a finding that Cal. Civil Procedure Code 877.6
3 applies. Three, the due process rights of BAC or other
4 nonsettling parties will not be affected. And four, an
5 adversary proceeding already exists. The trustee argues that
6 the modified bar order should extinguish BAC's notice concerns.

7 As an initial matter, because the trustee did not
8 address whether a 9019 motion or an adversary proceeding was
9 required in the motion, the Court need not consider any
10 authority or argument the trustee advanced in the reply. It is
11 well-established in the Ninth Circuit that issues cannot be
12 raised for the first time in reply briefs. The Local
13 Bankruptcy Rules in this district also provide that new
14 arguments or matters raised for the first time in reply
15 documents will not be considered.

16 Although the trustee may contend -- and he didn't in
17 his reply, but he could contend that he was only responding to
18 BAC's arguments in the opposition, the Court would not find
19 that persuasive. The trustee and trustee's counsel are
20 sophisticated and certainly knew that whether the requested
21 relief could be obtained via motion rather than an adversary
22 proceeding would be an issue that would be raised. Rather than
23 addressing the issue in the motion, they chose to sit back and
24 wait to provide authority and analysis in the reply, to which
25 BAC had no opportunity to respond.

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

60

1 Even if that were not the case, and even if the Court
2 considered, and it did consider, the argument and authority the
3 trustee provided in the reply, it would not make a difference.
4 The Court finds the trustee's reliance on five cases from
5 within the Eleventh Circuit are not persuasive. Two of those
6 cases are from the circuit itself. One is Munford from 1996,
7 and one is Superior Homes, an unpublished decision. Neither of
8 those cases, however, addressed or even mentioned whether an
9 adversary proceeding was necessary for imposition of a bar
10 order.

11 In Munford, Munford, Inc. filed bankruptcy after a
12 failed leveraged buyout and then filed an adversary proceeding
13 seeking avoidance and recovery of transfers from numerous
14 defendants, including VRC. VRC offered to settle the adversary
15 proceeding claims for 350,000 of its 400,000 liability
16 insurance policy. Conditions on the bankruptcy court enjoining
17 the nonsettling defendants from seeking contribution from VRC
18 or its insurer. The bankruptcy court approved the settlement
19 agreement, permanently enjoining the nonsettling defendants
20 from asserting contribution and indemnity claims against VRC
21 under 105 and FRCP 16.

22 The nonsettling defendants appealed, and the Eleventh
23 Circuit first addressed whether the bankruptcy court had
24 subject-matter jurisdiction over nonsettling defendants'
25 unasserted state law contributions and indemnity claims, and it

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

61

1 determined that the bankruptcy court did. It next focused on
2 105 and FRCP 16, concluding that 105 and FRCP 16 authorize the
3 bankruptcy court to enter bar orders where such orders are
4 integral to settlement in an adversary proceeding.

5 In Superior Homes, an unpublished decision, the
6 Eleventh Circuit was confronted with whether the bankruptcy
7 court had subject-matter jurisdiction over state-court
8 litigation involving nondebtor defendants. Citing Munford, the
9 court noted that bankruptcy-court jurisdiction extends to
10 disputes between third parties in litigation and empowered the
11 bankruptcy court to bar litigation via a 9019 compromise.

12 In one of the district court cases the trustee cites
13 from within the Eleventh Circuit, Land Resources, Land
14 Resources and its affiliates filed Chapter 11 cases that were
15 converted to Chapter 7 and jointly administered. The Chapter 7
16 trustee, Meininger, filed several actions against Robert Ward,
17 the CEO of Land Resources, his family members, and an
18 indemnitor of certain bonds issued on behalf of Land Resources
19 in state and federal court seeking to avoid fraudulent
20 transfers. Meininger also filed a claim on behalf of the
21 debtors in a probate action involving Ward's deceased wife.

22 Bond Safeguard Insurance and Lexon Insurance
23 companies, the insurers who had issued bonds on behalf of Land
24 Resources and its subsidiaries, filed two separate actions in
25 district court. Other actions including a writ of attachment

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

62

1 and garnishment actions were filed in Georgia and Florida state
2 court. The trustee also filed an adversary proceeding against
3 the debtors' joint-venture partners, including Realan
4 Investment Partners and Weeks-Grey Rock, who had allegedly been
5 beneficiaries of fraudulent transfers while the debtors were
6 insolvent. That was called the Euram litigation.

7 The trustee eventually settled with the Ward parties
8 for 925,000 dollars in exchange for, among other things, the
9 trustee's voluntary dismissal or withdrawal of the debtors'
10 claims in the probate action and the adversary proceedings.
11 The trustee filed a 9019 motion seeking a bar order permanently
12 enjoining the trustee and debtors' creditors from pursuing any
13 actions against the Ward parties arising from, related to, or
14 based upon or deriving from the debtors' business activities.

15 Separately, the trustee filed a 9019 motion seeking
16 approval of an agreement with the insurers through which they
17 agreed to fund all professional fees and costs up to 750,000
18 dollars associated or related to the trustee's prosecution of
19 the Euram litigation, and in return, the insurers would receive
20 a specific portion of any award or a settlement achieved in
21 that case. According to the trustee, the two settlement
22 agreements would result in about fifty million reduction in the
23 insurers' allowed claims and reclassification from
24 administrative to general unsecured.

25 Realan and Weeks-Grey objected to the trustee's 9019

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

63

1 motion regarding the settlement with the Ward party, arguing,
2 among other things, that a bar order could only be entered in
3 an adversary proceeding. The bankruptcy court overruled the
4 objection and approved the settlement.

5 Realan and Weeks-Grey appealed. The district court
6 affirmed, focusing primarily on the bankruptcy court's
7 Constitutional authority to approve the Ward's settlement
8 agreement, which contained the bar order, as well as its
9 subject-matter jurisdiction to approve the bar order. In a
10 footnote, the district court stated that the Eleventh Circuit
11 had upheld bankruptcy courts' approval of bar orders in
12 conjunction with a 9019 motion rather than an adversary
13 proceeding, citing Superior Court (sic). But as noted, the
14 issue of whether an adversary proceeding was necessary was not
15 raised or addressed in Superior Home.

16 In Estate of Jackson, that involved a complex, eleven-
17 year litigation, and the bankruptcy court was confronted with
18 whether to approve two settlements, which would bring
19 approximately twenty million into the bankruptcy estate. The
20 litigation emanated from six wrongful-death lawsuits filed by
21 probate estates against THMI, debtor's wholly-owned subsidiary
22 and THMI's former corporate parent. The settlements were
23 conditioned on the court entering a bar order barring the
24 nonsettling defendants, who prevailed, after dismissal, summary
25 judgment, or trial from suing the settling defendants for

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

64

1 indemnification contribution or other claims.

2 The nonsettling defendants objected to the
3 settlements, particularly the bar order. Addressing the issue
4 that is currently before this Court, the bankruptcy court
5 stated that the Eleventh Circuit had expressly held that 105
6 "is ample authority for entry of a bar order". In response to
7 the nonsettling defendants' argument that their request for a
8 permanent injunction was not procedurally proper because a
9 separate adversary had not been filed, the Court noted that in
10 addition to 105, the Eleventh Circuit has recognized that the
11 All Writ Act codifies the long-recognized power of courts of
12 equity to effectuate their decrees by injunctions or writs of
13 assistance.

14 Finally, in Hartog, Exporter Bonded Corporation, EBC,
15 filed a Chapter 11 in the United States through the Alcohol and
16 Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau held a 1.7-million-dollar allowed
17 claim against the estate. Pre-petition Rivero Investment Group
18 bought real property from which the debtor operated.
19 Continental Duty Free operated from the same location. Three
20 persons named Rivero owned and controlled both entities.

21 The debtor funded about 217,000 dollars of the real
22 property's deposit, and the Riveros and Continental contributed
23 about 650,000 dollars. RIG rented the property to the debtor
24 and Continental. During the bankruptcy case, the property was
25 sold, resulting in four million in proceeds. As of the

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

65

1 petition date, RIG owed the debtor about 890,000 dollars.

2 About a year after the case was filed, it was converted to 7,
3 and Hartog was appointed as the Chapter 7 trustee. He
4 informally asserted various claims against Continental and RIG,
5 eventually entering into a pre-suit settlement, providing that
6 Continental and RIG would pay 965,000 dollars to the estate.

7 The settlement was contingent on entry of a bar order
8 enjoining creditors from pursuing the settling parties or their
9 properties arising out of or related to any of the facts,
10 occurrences, or transactions alleged, or which could have been
11 alleged, by the trustee that arise out of or relate in any way
12 to the debtor, the bankruptcy case, or any claims available to
13 the debtor's bankruptcy case. The trustee filed a 9019 motion,
14 and the ATT objected because it wanted to pursue claims against
15 RIG and Continental to collect the full tax owed by the debtor
16 based on the sale of the real property. ATT conceded that its
17 claims belong to the bankruptcy estate. The bankruptcy court
18 approved the settlement and bar order.

19 One of the issues that ATT raised on appeal was that
20 the bankruptcy court erred in issuing an injunction outside of
21 an adversary proceeding. Citing Superior Homes, Land
22 Resources, and relying on 105, FRCP 16, and the All Writs Act,
23 the district court held that an adversary proceeding was not
24 necessary. The court discounted ATT's reliance on Zale, a
25 Fifth Circuit case from 1995, and that court's holding that an

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

66

1 adversary proceeding was required to enjoin third-party claims
2 based on what the Court described as "binding Eleventh Circuit
3 precedent".

4 The Court does not find the cases from within the
5 Eleventh Circuit persuasive for a number of reasons. First, a
6 careful reading of the two Eleventh Circuit cases the trustee
7 cites reveals that the Eleventh Circuit was not confronted with
8 and did not address whether an adversary proceeding was
9 required to issue an injunction or a bar order. Second, the
10 bankruptcy and district court from within the Eleventh Circuit
11 relied on 105, FRCP 16, and the All Writs Act to find that
12 adversary proceedings were not required, which this Court does
13 not find compelling.

14 First, in *Law v. Siegel*, the Supreme Court held that
15 bankruptcy courts cannot use 105 to override other sections of
16 the Bankruptcy Code. In the Ninth Circuit, this has been
17 extended to the FRBP. That's *Anwar versus Johnson*, 720 F.3d
18 1183 (9th Cir. 2013). And in that case, the Ninth Circuit held
19 that bankruptcy courts may only exercise their equitable powers
20 within the confines of the Bankruptcy Code, which includes
21 deadlines set by the FRBP, because granting retroactive
22 extension of a deadline would conflict with the plain language
23 of FRBP 4007 and 9006. The Court could not rely on equitable
24 powers under 105 to do so.

25 Although the trustee asserts that he is not seeking a

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

67

1 finding that 105 provides a substantive basis for a bar order,
2 but rather that it provides a procedural vehicle for applying
3 877.6 via a 9019 motion, the Court does not find this argument
4 compelling. He cites no authority for this distinction, and
5 the Court was able to locate any. Additionally, based on the
6 Court's reading of Anwar, the Ninth Circuit would disagree with
7 the trustee's assertion.

8 Second, although the courts in Fundamental Long Term
9 care and Hartog based their authority to issue the bar order,
10 at least in part on the All Writs Acts, the Ninth Circuit has
11 not yet determined whether bankruptcy courts fall within the
12 scope of the All Writs Act.

13 Third, FRCP generally governs pre-trial procedures,
14 including conferences, scheduling, and management. In
15 contrast, FRBP 7001(7) is much more specific and provides that
16 a proceeding to obtain injunctive or other equitable relief
17 must be sought via adversary proceeding. A general rule of
18 statutory construction is that the specific governs over the
19 general.

20 In contrast to the Eleventh Circuit cases cited by the
21 trustee, the Fifth Circuit has directly addressed the issue of
22 whether an injunction can be sought via motion. In *Zale*, after
23 *Zale Corporation* and its affiliates filed Chapter 11, the
24 official creditors' committees began investigating claims
25 against *Zale's* former directors. Those were Gerstein, Gill,

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

68

1 Gillies, and Feld and others.

2 Under the threat of litigation, the directors began
3 negotiations and settlement discussions with the creditor
4 committees. The negotiations included discussions regarding
5 Zale's D&O liability policy. Cigna Insurance had issued a ten-
6 million-dollar primary policy, National Union Fire had issued
7 an excess policy up to fifteen million, and there was another
8 ten million policy that covered Gerstein, Gill, and Gillies.

9 Zale and Gerstein, Gill, and Gillies on one side and
10 Cigna on the other filed a motion seeking approval of a
11 settlement agreement. The settlement indicated that Gerstein,
12 Gill, and Gillies would agree to a thirty-two-million-dollar
13 judgment against them to be paid out of insurance proceeds, and
14 they were to sign to Zale all rights under the policy.
15 Included in the agreement was a provision that conditioned the
16 settlement on the grant of a permanent injunction, preventing
17 parties from suing the settling parties for their actions in
18 reaching the settlement or from otherwise seeking to
19 collaterally attack the settlement agreement.

20 The purported reason for the injunction was to prevent
21 NUFIC, who is National Union Fire Insurance Company, and Feld,
22 the director excluded from the agreement, from bringing claims
23 against Cigna. There was also a provision under which Zale
24 agreed to indemnify Cigna for bad faith or other claims against
25 it, regardless of the settlement.

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

69

1 The bankruptcy court approved the settlement motion
2 over the objection of NUFIC and Feld. They appealed, arguing
3 that the injunction deprive them of rights, which the Court
4 could not do because neither NUFIC nor Feld were parties to the
5 agreement. The district court affirmed.

6 NUFIC and Feld appealed to the Fifth Circuit, arguing,
7 among other things, that the bankruptcy court erred in granting
8 the injunction without conducting a full adversary proceeding.
9 The Fifth Circuit noted that Cigna and Zale had not filed a
10 complaint to determine injunctive relief, but instead simply
11 added the injunction to the settlement agreement. The Fifth
12 Circuit stated that "including a matter governed by Rule 7001
13 in another matter already before the court does not satisfy the
14 Procedural Rules required by Rule 7001."

15 The Fifth Circuit concluded that Cigna and Zale failed
16 to initiate properly their request for injunctive relief, and
17 the Fifth Circuit reversed the district court's order approving
18 the settlement, vacated the settlement, and remanded to the
19 district court.

20 The Court finds that the Fifth Circuit's analysis in
21 Zale is compelling and more persuasive than the Eleventh
22 Circuit cases the trustee relies on, which contain no
23 discussion or analysis of whether an adversary or a 9019 motion
24 was required. Although in the reply, the trustee claims that
25 after Zale, courts within the Fifth Circuit have entered

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

70

1 injunctions and not required adversary proceedings, this
2 argument requires little analysis.

3 In the case cited by the trustee, Mirant, debtor
4 sought district-court approval of a settlement agreement and
5 363 sale between Mirant and settling parties. The settlement
6 agreement provided that after the settlement, all parties
7 holding interests against or in the debtor or other transferred
8 assets would be barred from asserting that the persons or
9 entities' interests against the party acquiring the transferred
10 assets.

11 Mirant is inapposite. First, it contained no
12 discussion or analysis of whether an adversary proceeding was
13 required. Further, it involved a 9019 motion as part of a sale
14 motion, rather than a bar against nonsettling defendants from
15 seeking indemnity or contribution, which is the issue here.

16 The trustee contends that he's seeking a bar order and
17 not an injunction, and therefore he can contend that FRBP 7001
18 is inapplicable. The Court disagrees. The difference between
19 a bar order and an injunction is a matter of semantics.
20 Black's Law Dictionary defines a bar as to prevent or prohibit
21 and an injunction as a court order preventing an action.

22 The trustee also seems to argue that FRBP 7001(7) is
23 limited to injunctions brought under FRBP, but the plain
24 language of FRBP 7001(7) is not that narrow. If Congress had
25 meant to limit the reach of FRBP 7001(7) to apply only to

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

71

1 injunctions brought under FRBP 7065, it would have said so.

2 The Court recognizes that the standard for making a
3 good-faith finding under 877.6, which the trustee describes as
4 a bar order, and an injunction are different. However, the end
5 result, which is the issue here, is the same. One party, in
6 this case, BAC, CAVIC, and Universal Leader, Glove Assets would
7 be enjoined from any and all claims in any state or federal
8 jurisdiction or any other forum or tribunal against the
9 settling defendants or for equitable comparative contribution
10 or partial or comparative indemnity based on comparative
11 negligence or comparative fault.

12 And that portion that I just mentioned has been
13 described as a modified bar order, but the Court notes that
14 there is no modified bar order on the docket. It is a
15 statement in the trustee's reply about how the bar order would
16 be modified.

17 Finally, as stated succinctly by the Ninth Circuit in
18 the context of a sale motion, "Bankruptcy Rule 7001 designates
19 ten categories of proceedings as adversary proceedings. The
20 trustee may obtain the authority he seeks only through an
21 adversary proceeding. The bankruptcy court's equitable powers
22 do not allow it to derogate from Rule 7001". And that's In re:
23 Lyons, 995 F.2d 923 (9th Cir. 1993).

24 Because the motion is not the proper procedural
25 mechanism in which to seek a bar order, the Court could deny

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

72

1 the motion on that basis alone. But even if that were not the
2 case, the motion must still be denied for the following
3 substantive reasons.

4 First, which law applies to the settlement agreement.
5 In a footnote in the motion, the trustee summarily states that
6 California law applies. That's footnote 3 in the motion.

7 In the opposition, BAC and its related entities argue
8 that the Court rejected the trustee's position that California
9 law applies to the tort claims against them, instead finding
10 that New York law applied to those claims when it dismissed
11 with prejudice the FAC against BAC.

12 BAC highlight that the Court found that the choice of
13 law provisions in the Zetta BAC APAs were broad, governing both
14 the routine aspects of a contractual relationship as well as
15 any related claims arising under common law or statute,
16 including claim sounding and torts. BAC assert that New York
17 law applies with equal force to any potential contribution or
18 indemnification liability that BAC may face.

19 In the reply, the trustee argues that because
20 California law governs the tort claims against the settling
21 defendants, it should also govern the settlement agreement. He
22 highlights that the claims against the settling defendants were
23 initiated, prosecuted, and ultimately settled in California,
24 and they concern a California entity, Zetta Jet USA. The
25 trustee posits that the only reason New York law governed the

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

73

1 BAC claims was the choice of law provision in the Zetta and BAC
2 APAs and the choice of law provision that the trustee and the
3 settling defendants included in the settlement agreements
4 specify that California law applies.

5 The trustee did not fully address the issue of what
6 law applied in the motion. In fact, the trustee's position
7 that California law applied was mentioned in passing in a
8 three-sentence footnote -- excuse me, in a three-line footnote.
9 It was not until the reply that the trustee explained why he
10 believed that California law applied and cited a few cases, in
11 addition to Nucorp, which was mentioned in the motion to
12 support his position that California law applies.

13 Therefore, as previously noted, the Court need not
14 consider the argument or citations the trustee advanced for the
15 first time in the reply regarding the applicable law. Even if
16 that were not the case and the trustee -- and the Court did
17 consider the argument and the authority the trustee cites in
18 the reply, the Court finds that the trustee's position is not
19 well taken. In the reply, the trustee cites Nucorp, Commercial
20 Union, and Chen. The first two cases are district court cases,
21 and the third one is from the California Supreme Court.

22 Nucorp involved securities litigation stemming from
23 the sale of Nucorp securities. The plaintiffs engaged in
24 intensive settlement negotiations, resulting in the plaintiffs
25 and certain defendants, primarily Nucorp's officers and

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

74

1 directors, executing a forty-one-million-dollar settlement.
2 The settlement provided that it was made in good faith under
3 877 and 877.6, and all claims for contribution or
4 indemnification against the settling defendants arising under
5 federal securities law or state law in favor of any person
6 asserted to be a joint tortfeasor were extinguished,
7 discharged, satisfied, and/or otherwise unenforceable.

8 After a hearing, the magistrate judge found that the
9 settlement was executed in good faith. Four of the nonsettling
10 defendants sought de novo review from the district court of the
11 good-faith finding and the order barring indemnification and
12 contribution. The nonsettling defendants argued that if they
13 were found liable as joint tortfeasors with the settling
14 defendants under the pendent state law claims, they would have
15 state law contribution and indemnification causes of action.

16 Two of the nonsettling defendants allege that
17 California law didn't apply to the contribution and
18 indemnification claims, which they claim should be governed by
19 Texas and New York law. The court disagreed, noting that
20 federal courts exercising pendent jurisdiction must apply the
21 choice of law and rules of the state in which it sits. It
22 indicated that California courts apply the governmental
23 interest analysis to resolve choice-of-law problems.

24 According to the court, although Texas and New York
25 had some interest in the litigation, one of the nonsettling

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

75

1 defendants was headquartered in New York and another was
2 incorporated in Texas, the settlement was negotiated and
3 executed in California, a partially-terminated multidistrict
4 litigation that was initiated and consolidated in California,
5 and the litigation involved a corporation whose chief operation
6 during the alleged fraud was in San Diego. Therefore, the
7 court held that California law applied.

8 Similarly in Commercial Union, John Meyers sued
9 Haberfelde, Ford, and Ford Motor Company for injuries he
10 incurred in an automobile accident rendering him a
11 quadriplegic. In a tactical maneuver on the eve of trial, he
12 dismissed Ford from the suit, and the trial proceeded against
13 Haberfelde, with the jury rendering a verdict of 3.25 million.
14 Before and during the trial, Meyers offered to settle, first
15 for 150,000 and then for 350. Commercial Union, Haberfelde's
16 insurer, refused both settlement offers.

17 After trial, Commercial settled the case for 2.875.
18 Commercial then sued Ford for partial indemnity regarding that
19 payment. Although Ford contended that Washington or Oregon law
20 controlled the question of indemnity, the court noted that
21 California had an interest in applying the indemnity law.
22 Because Haberfelde was a California resident, the underlying
23 personal injury action was tried in a California court, and
24 Haberfelde's negligence in repairing the car, which was the
25 basis for the judgment against it, occurred in California.

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

76

1 Finally, the trustee cites Chen, a state court case
2 involving a lawsuit that was filed after a fatal bus crash,
3 which potentially implicated four jurisdictions, Indiana,
4 Arizona, California, and China. The trial court determined
5 that the governmental interest test required application of
6 Indiana law. Before trial, the plaintiff settled and dismissed
7 the Indiana defendant from the action. The issue before the
8 appellate court was whether after dismissal of the Indiana
9 defendant, the trial court was required to reconsider its prior
10 choice-of-law ruling. The court of appeals answered that
11 question no.

12 In contrast to Nucorp, this case does not involve
13 pendent jurisdiction over the claims the trustee seeks to
14 settle. Further, unlike Commercial Union, a case in which
15 subject-matter jurisdiction was based on diversity, here, the
16 Court has original jurisdiction over the Jetcraft adversary
17 proceeding claims.

18 And Chen is inapposite. It was a state court case
19 where the court utilized the governmental interest test to
20 determine applicable state law. In contrast, in bankruptcy
21 cases, as the trustee has acknowledged, under binding Ninth
22 Circuit precedent, courts utilized the Restatement (Second)
23 Conflicts of Law to determine the applicable law. The trustee
24 acknowledged this in the opposition to BAC and its related
25 entities' motion to dismiss. That was filed on January 14,

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

77

1 '22. That's docket number 349.

2 Although the trustee cites In re: Allstate, a District
3 of Arizona decision, in both the motion and reply, his reliance
4 on that case is not persuasive. There, an Arizona district
5 court approved an unopposed settlement agreement which
6 contained a bar order, which was issued with a settlement
7 agreement in a consolidated securities-fraud action.

8 The problem for the trustee is the order he -- is that
9 in that order which he cites, it does not contain any
10 information regarding the evidence substantiating the court's
11 good-faith finding. Without more, it merely indicates that
12 based on facts in that case, which are impossible to discern
13 from the order, the Court found that contribution and
14 indemnification claims under Federal Securities Law, Arizona
15 statutes and Cal. Civil Procedure Code 877 were barred.

16 Further, the trustee asserts that the tort claims that
17 are at issue in the settlement agreement were initiated,
18 prosecuted, and ultimately settled in California concerning a
19 California entity. That argument is unavailing. It is true
20 that the Jetcraft AP was filed in California, but there's no
21 evidence before the Court that this settlement occurred in
22 California. It is beyond dispute that the trustee and
23 trustee's lead counsel are in Chicago, and all litigation
24 appears to be directed from there.

25 Retired Judge Gross, who mediated the case, is located

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

78

1 in Delaware. Lead counsel for the FK defendants and Jetcraft
2 defendants are located in Washington, D.C. Fazal-Karim is a
3 resident of Dubai. And Jetcraft Corp. is a Delaware
4 corporation with a principal place of business in North
5 Carolina. Jetcraft Global and Jetcraft Asia are British Virgin
6 Islands corporations with their principal place of business in
7 North Carolina. Jetcoast is a Delaware corporation with a
8 North Carolina mailing address.

9 And the trustee's assertion that the settlement
10 involved a California entity, Zetta USA is only minimally
11 correct. The trustee is leaving out the fact that he is a
12 trustee for two separate debtors, Zetta Singapore and Zetta
13 USA. Each debtor filed its own case, and the cases have not
14 been consolidated. And it is clear from the FAAC's allegations
15 regarding the tort claims that Zetta Singapore, not Zetta USA,
16 executed each of the APAs that are at issue in the tort claims.

17 The FAAC indicates that Zetta USA operated the planes
18 under its Part 135 certificates, which were required to comply
19 with FAA regulations, and Zetta USA also guaranteed the
20 aircraft financing. But it's undisputed that Zetta USA did not
21 execute the APAs or enter into any agreements to buy more
22 aircraft that were at issue in the tort claims.

23 As the Court noted when ruling on the FK and related
24 entities' motion to dismiss, this is docket 384, "central to
25 the allegation supporting the tort claims", those are counts I,

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

79

1 II, III, VI, and VII, "is that the FK defendants, Jetcraft, and
2 BAC (indiscernible) paid Cassidy two 500,000-dollar bribes,
3 provided him with Formula One tickets, and promised him sea
4 dues to cause the debtor to enter transactions and take
5 delivery of overpriced aircraft.

6 In the ruling on the FK defendant's motion to dismiss
7 the first amended complaint, the Court addressed a similar
8 argument that the trustee advances here regarding conduct
9 occurring in California. In the context of ruling on Count
10 III, the California unfair competition claim, the Court
11 determined there were insufficient allegations to support a
12 California nexus because Zetta Singapore executed Plane 1 and
13 10's APAs, not Zetta USA, which obligated Zetta Singapore to
14 pay for those aircraft.

15 The Court also considered and rejected the trustee's
16 position that the debtors' primary base of operation was
17 California because the trustee argued that the debtors' key
18 personnel were located here, and they operated revenue-
19 generating flights in California.

20 Although Seagrim and Walter, directors of both Zetta
21 Singapore and Zetta USA were located in Burbank, Zetta
22 Singapore bought the aircrafts and the transactions did not
23 close in California and the kickbacks and sea due credit
24 against the Nyota were not authorized or received in
25 California. The law of the case doctrine and prohibits this

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

80

1 Court from considering again whether the debtors' primary base
2 of operation was in California.

3 It is true that when ruling on the motion to dismiss
4 the first amended complaint, the Court applied California law
5 to the tort claims against the FK defendants. But contrary to
6 the trustee's assertion, the Court made no findings that the
7 torts the trustee seeks to settle actually occurred in
8 California. In fact, as noted, the Court found to the
9 contrary.

10 The trustee, who has burden on a 9019 motion, has not
11 analyzed or provided any authority that the Restatement
12 (Second) Conflict of Law would require the Court to apply
13 California law to the settlement agreement. Therefore, the
14 Court finds the trustee has not met his burden of demonstrating
15 that California law applies to the settlement. Even if,
16 however, the trustee had presented sufficient evidence,
17 argument, and analysis substantiating his assertion that
18 California law applied to the settlement agreement, it would
19 not matter because as the Court will analyze, there is
20 insufficient evidence from which the Court can make a good-
21 faith finding under Tech-Bilt.

22 In the motion, the trustee argues that the settlement
23 agreement satisfies the relevant Tech-Bilt good-faith factors.
24 Although the trustee acknowledges that the settling defendants'
25 liability exceeds the 9.5-million-dollar settlement amount, he

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

81

1 reasons that it is recognized that a settlor should pay less
2 than it would if found liable after trial.

3 The trustee contends that a settlor -- the trustee
4 contends that the likelihood of success if the claims were
5 litigated is uncertain and the settlement amount is fair in
6 light of the strengths and weaknesses of the trustee's claims
7 and the expense, delay, and risk inherent in litigation. The
8 trustee explains that there is no evidence of fraud or
9 collusion that would injure the nonsettling parties and the
10 settlement agreement resulted from good-faith mediation.

11 BAC and its related entities respond that the trustee
12 cannot satisfy the good-faith factors. They assert that
13 California courts have consistently held that a settling
14 defendants' proportional liability is one of the most important
15 factors, and courts regularly deny settlement when the moving
16 party fails to demonstrate that its settling parties' liability
17 for the plaintiff's approximate recovery is roughly consistent
18 with the amount being paid in settlement.

19 BAC highlight that the trustee's position that the
20 settling defendants' liability exceeds the settlement amount
21 falls short of what is required. They argue that relying on
22 mediation and the November 29th mediator's report to
23 demonstrate good faith is insufficient for the Court to make a
24 good-faith finding, which would require a full evidentiary
25 hearing based on a developed record in accordance with 877.6.

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

82

1 In the reply, the trustee reiterates that he has
2 satisfied the good-faith factors and asserts that BAC's focus
3 on proportionate liability is misplaced. He argues that the
4 party asserting lack of good faith has the burden of proof,
5 which can only be met if they showed that the settlement is so
6 far out of the ballpark of good faith that the settlement is
7 inconsistent with the equitable objectives of the statute. The
8 trustee contends that good faith may be challenged only when
9 the settlement is grossly disproportionate to what a reasonable
10 person at the time of the settlement was estimate the settling
11 parties' liability to be. He asserts that a court is not
12 required to determine approximate liability with precision, but
13 an educated guess will suffice.

14 Cal. Civil Procedure Code 877 provides where a
15 release, dismissal with or without prejudice, or a covenant not
16 to sue is given in good faith before a verdict or judgment to
17 one or more of a number of tortfeasors claimed to be liable for
18 the same tort, or to one or more coobligors mutually subject to
19 contribution rights, it shall have the following effect: A, it
20 shall not discharge any other such party from liability unless
21 its terms so provide, but it shall reduce the claims against
22 the others in the amount stipulated by the release, the
23 dismissal, or the covenant, or in the amount of the
24 consideration paid for it, whichever is the greater; and B, it
25 shall discharge the party to whom it is given from all

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

83

1 liability for any contribution to any other party.

2 Cal. Civil Procedure Code 877.6 is titled
3 "Determination of good faith of settlement with one or more
4 tortfeasors or obligors". Section (a)(2) provides, "a settling
5 party may give notice of settlement to all parties and to the
6 court, together with an application for determination of good-
7 faith settlement and a proposed order. The application shall
8 indicate the settling parties, and the basis, terms, and amount
9 of the settlement."

10 (b), "The issue of good faith of a settlement may be
11 determined by the party (sic) on the basis of affidavits served
12 with the notice of hearing, and any counter-affidavits filed in
13 response, or the court may, in its discretion, receive other
14 evidence in the hearing."

15 (c), "A determination by the court that the settlement
16 was made in good faith shall bar any other joint tortfeasor or
17 coobligor from any further claims against the settling
18 tortfeasor coobligor for equitable comparative contribution, or
19 partial or comparative indemnity, based on comparative
20 negligence or comparative fault.

21 "The party asserting lack of good faith shall have the
22 burden of proof on the issue."

23 According to the California Supreme Court in assessing
24 whether a settlement is made in good faith, courts examine
25 whether the amount of the settlement is within the reasonable

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

84

1 range of the settling tortfeasor's proportional share of
2 comparative liability for the plaintiff's injury. That's from
3 Tech-Bilt. Factors that the courts consider, and these are
4 called the good-faith factors:

5 A rough approximation of plaintiff's total recovery
6 and the settlor's proportionate liability; two, the amount paid
7 in the settlement; three, the allocation of settlement proceeds
8 among plaintiffs; four, a recognition that a settlor should pay
9 less in settlement than it would if it were found liable after
10 trial; five, the financial conditions and insurance policy
11 limits of settling defendants; six, the existence of collusion,
12 fraud, or tortious conduct aimed to injure the nonsettling
13 defendants' interests.

14 According to the California Supreme Court, 877.6
15 requires courts to review agreements "to ensure that such
16 settlements approximately balance the contribution statute's
17 dual objectives, which are equal sharing of costs among parties
18 at fault and encouragement of settlement. Determining whether
19 a settlement is in good faith is a matter left to the sound
20 discretion of the trial court." That's Navarro, 2018 WL
21 6242155, Central District California, 2018.

22 If the issue of good faith is contested, there must be
23 a sufficient showing of all Tech-Bilt factors, either in the
24 original moving papers or in counter declarations. That's
25 Navarro at *4. One of the most important factors is the

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

85

1 settling parties' proportionate liability. That's Toyota Motor
2 Sales, 220 Cal.App.3d 864, 1990.

3 As the court in Tech-Bilt noted, the question is
4 whether the settlement presents a good-faith determination of
5 the defendant's relative liabilities. If there is no
6 substantial evidence to support a critical assumption as to the
7 nature and extent of a settling defendant's liability, then a
8 determination of good faith is an abuse of discretion. Toyota,
9 200 Cal.App.3d at 871.

10 A party asserting a lack of good faith who has the
11 burden of proof on that issue should be allowed to present
12 evidence demonstrating that the settlement is so out of the
13 ballpark to be inconsistent with the equitable objectives of
14 877.6. Tech-Bilt.

15 Both the trustee and BAC cite and rely on
16 Zahnleuter -- I'm not saying that correctly; it's 2021 WL
17 4975392 -- to support their respective positions. In that
18 case, the district court was confronted with whether to approve
19 a settlement agreement under 877.6. Katherine Zahnleuter
20 alleged that her sister, Amy Mueller, conspired with an
21 attorney, Gabriel Lenhart and his firm, collectively called
22 Lenhart, to fraudulently amend a family trust.

23 Zahnleuter asserted that the fraudulent amendment
24 forced her to seek costly relief in a state court case which
25 ended abruptly during trial when evidence of the fraud came to

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

86

1 light. Zahnleuter sued in federal court, seeking damages for
2 attorneys' fees and other expenses she incurred in the state
3 court litigation.

4 Lenhart and Zahnleuter then reached a settlement
5 agreement. Lenhart would pay 105,000 to Zahnleuter in exchange
6 for her release of all claims against him. Lenhart submitted
7 two declarations from the attorney who represented him and
8 (indiscernible) finding from the Court that the settlement
9 complied with 877.6 good-faith requirements.

10 After citing the Tech-Bilt factors, the court noted
11 that there needed to be some evidentiary basis for evaluating
12 the proportionate liability and total approximate recovery.
13 According to the court, proportionate liability is one of the
14 most important factors a court must examine when determining a
15 settlement has been made in good faith under 877.6. And if
16 there is not substantial evidence to support a critical
17 assumption as to the nature and extent of a settling
18 defendant's liability, then a determination of good faith based
19 on some such assumption is an abuse of discretion. That's
20 Zahnleuter citing Toyota Motors.

21 The court in Zahnleuter indicated that based on the
22 record, it could not determine whether the settlement properly
23 took account of Lenhart's proportionate liability, and it could
24 not conclude it was made in good faith. The only estimate of
25 total damages, 400,000 dollars, was included in Zahnleuter's

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

87

1 initial disclosures, and even assuming that amount was
2 accurate, the 105,000-dollar settlement accounted for
3 approximately twenty-five percent of the defendant's total
4 exposure, although Lenhart defendants had greatest potential
5 liability.

6 Counsel represented that the settlement was reasonable
7 because he believed that Lenhart would be found no more than
8 fifty per liable, but the court indicated there was no
9 explanation for why that was so. In dicta, the court opined
10 that a declaration or testimony from an expert familiar with
11 pertinent valuation criteria may be sufficient to show a
12 settlement falls within a reasonable range. So can a
13 declaration from an experienced settlement negotiator.

14 But the court determined that two conclusory
15 declarations from counsel were insufficient. And that court
16 concluded by citing Espinoza, an Eastern District of California
17 case, "Whatever method is utilized in a contested case, the
18 information provided must be sufficient to reasonably place a
19 value on the underlying claim so the court can conduct a Tech-
20 Bilt analysis."

21 Both sides also refer to Navarro from the Central
22 District of California to support their positions. In Navarro,
23 the district court was confronted with whether there was
24 sufficient evidence to make a good faith finding under 877.6.
25 Norma Navarro and Waldemar Valentin were driving in a car that

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

88

1 was involved in an automobile accident with a tractor-trailer
2 truck that Fred Hamilton had parked on the side of the freeway.
3 Valentin, who was driving, lost control of the vehicle,
4 collided with the truck. Valentin and Navarro were both
5 seriously injured and sued Hamilton and his company for various
6 negligence causes of action.

7 Hamilton removed the case to district court, and
8 counterclaims alleging that Valentin, who pled guilty to DUI,
9 was driving under the influence, which was a sole or
10 substantial factor in his and Navarro's injuries. Hamilton
11 asserted equitable indemnity and contribution claims against
12 Valentin. Valentin and Navarro settled for 15,000 dollars in
13 exchange for a release of all claims arising from the accident,
14 and Valentin sought a good-faith finding under 877.6.

15 The court began its analysis by recognizing that
16 principle among the Tech-Bilt factors is whether the amount
17 paid in settlement bears a reasonable relationship to the
18 settlor's proportionate share. The court noted that the
19 parties had not provided a sufficient evidentiary basis to
20 determine whether the settlement was made in good faith.

21 The court recognized that in most cases, a settling
22 defendant's good faith is uncontested and a bare bones motion
23 and declaration would suffice. Then, the burden would shift to
24 the nonsettlor to demonstrate lack of good faith. But if the
25 issue of good faith was contested, the settling tortfeasor must

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

89

1 make a sufficient showing of all Tech-Bilt factors, either in
2 the original moving papers or in counter declarations.

3 The court concluded by quoting City of Grand Terrace,
4 192 Cal.App.3d 1251, "A necessary corollary to the definition
5 of good faith in Tech-Bilt is that the trial court's
6 consideration of the settlement agreement and its relationship
7 to the entire litigation in a contested setting must proceed
8 upon a sufficient evidentiary basis to enable the court to
9 consider and evaluate the various aspects of the settlement.
10 If there is no substantial evidence to support a critical
11 assumption, then a court would abuse its discretion in making a
12 good-faith finding."

13 Here, there is a dearth of evidence from which the
14 Court could make a good-faith finding. First, in the trustee's
15 declaration, he summarily states the following, "I further
16 believe that the settlement agreement satisfies each of the
17 good-faith factors relevant to finding that the settlement
18 agreement was entered into good faith."

19 The only other evidence that the trustee presented to
20 support his position that 877.6 good-faith factors are met is
21 the November 29th mediator's report and the January 11th
22 mediator's statement. A careful reading of both those reports
23 or statements does not advance the trustee's position. In the
24 November 29th mediator's report, the mediator mentioned good
25 faith three times.

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

90

1 The parties "worked hard, consciously and in good
2 faith, to finalize a resolution". Two, he was "fully satisfied
3 that it is only by virtue of the parties' good faith and
4 commitment to achieving a settlement". That one was reached.
5 And three, the parties, in particular, the trustee, negotiated
6 the settlement with commitment and in good faith. These
7 statements address how the parties participated in the
8 negotiations before the mediator but provide no evidence from
9 which the Court can make a good-faith finding required by
10 877.6.

11 The January 11th mediator's statement likewise is
12 insufficient. It indicates that the trustee and the Jetcraft
13 defendants and FK defendants were aware of the Tech-Bilt
14 factors and took those factors into account in reaching a
15 settlement. The mediator opines that BAC, CAVIC, and
16 University Leader and Glove's opposition "do not treat the
17 trustee and the Jetcraft and FK defendants fairly regarding
18 their consideration of what a good-faith settlement requires."

19 The problem for the trustee is whether he and the
20 Jetcraft defendants considered the settlement to be in good
21 faith is not determinative. What is determinative is whether
22 the Court has sufficient evidence before it from which to find
23 that the good-faith factors have been met, and it does not. It
24 is undisputed that the trustee had the ability to provide
25 evidence necessary from which the Court could determine the

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

91

1 proportionate liability of the FK and Jetcraft defendants.

2 The trustee's financial advisers, first, Seabury and
3 now FTI, have billed and been paid approximately a million
4 dollars combined. The trustee did not present any evidence to
5 substantiate a good-faith finding, other than a conclusory
6 statement indicating that he believed the settlement agreement
7 satisfies the good-faith factors and the January 11th
8 mediator's statement that the trustee and settling defendants
9 were aware of the Tech-Bilt factors and took them into account.

10 This is a far cry from being sufficient for the Court
11 to evaluate the proportional liability of the settling
12 defendants and the total approximate recovery. The trustee is
13 correct that the burden is on the party asserting lack of good
14 faith to show that the settlement is so out of the ballpark
15 that it is inconsistent with the good-faith principles. But
16 here, there is no evidence of what that ballpark actually is.

17 Finally, the trustee's assertion that good faith may
18 only be challenged if a settlement is grossly disproportionate
19 to what a reasonable person would estimate the settling
20 parties' liability would be is a correct statement of the law.
21 Here, however, there is no evidence from which a reasonable
22 person could estimate the settling defendants' liability.

23 The trustee's argument in the reply brief regarding,
24 one, what Bombardier's and the settling defendant's liability
25 would be if he prevailed at trial; two, that Bombardier

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

92

1 benefited more from the settling defendants; and three,
2 Bombardier would be independently liable for fraudulent
3 transfer claims, which should not be factored into the settling
4 defendants' proportional liability, do not alter this
5 conclusion. Argument is not evidence. Therefore, even if
6 California law did apply to the settlement agreement without
7 sufficient evidence from which to make a good-faith finding, it
8 cannot be approved.

9 The trustee also argues that Bombardier's concerns
10 about proportionate liability are baseless because it has been
11 dismissed with prejudice from the Jetcraft adversary
12 proceeding. But the trustee has appealed that ruling, so any
13 argument that Bombardier's concerns are irrelevant is
14 unavailing.

15 Finally, although the motion was brought under Rule
16 9019, both the opposition and reply focus almost exclusively on
17 whether 877.6 and the Tech-Bilt good-faith factors are met. As
18 the trustee acknowledges, the standard for approving a 9019
19 motion is the same, or as one court opined, more exacting, than
20 the 877.6 standard because the trustee has the burden of proof
21 on a 9019 motion. As noted, there is insufficient evidence
22 from which the Court can make a good-faith finding under Tech-
23 Bilt.

24 Therefore, the Court finds that the trustee has not
25 met his burden of demonstrating that the 9019 motion should or

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

93

1 could be granted.

2 There were a couple of other issues that I want to
3 address regarding this motion in particular, and then we will
4 take a recess, as I noted, and we'll come back for the
5 remaining matters.

6 There were a couple of troubling issues involving the
7 briefing. Regarding a number of issues, the trustee either did
8 not address them in the motion, such as whether an adversary
9 proceeding or a motion was appropriate for the relief
10 requested, or summarily addressed them in a few lines, such as
11 the applicability of California law. It was only in the reply
12 brief that the trustee even addressed the proper procedural
13 mechanism for seeking the relief requested, and he cited
14 additional cases to support his position that California law
15 applied.

16 And in the reply brief, the trustee changed the terms
17 of the order after BAC raised issues regarding its scope that
18 there was no modified order on the docket. The trustee as well
19 as trustee's counsel are sophisticated, and they know it's
20 inappropriate to sit back, wait to see if an opponent or the
21 Court notices an issue, and then fully reply to it and fully
22 brief it in a reply.

23 As the Court noted in its ruling, the Court need not
24 consider an argument or case raised for the first time in the
25 reply. In the future, if this type of briefing continues by

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

94

1 any party, I will not consider any argument, case, statute, et
2 cetera that was not specifically mentioned in the motion.

3 There was also another issue that did not go
4 unnoticed. The reply brief contained lengthy footnotes. As
5 I'm sure each of the parties can recall, during a November
6 17th, 2021, status conference which the Court held because the
7 trustee had filed an oversized brief without first receiving
8 authorization to do so, the Court addressed a number of issues
9 regarding parties flouting the rules, filing late briefs, et
10 cetera. One of the issues that the Court specifically
11 mentioned was that footnotes had gotten out of control, with
12 some being a third or a half page long, and I ordered that
13 footnotes would be limited to three lines. The reply brief in
14 numerous places violates the Court's instruction.

15 To avoid any doubt in the future, if any party
16 violates those direct orders, not just regarding footnotes, but
17 regarding anything else that the Court addressed during that
18 hearing, and that's Jetcraft docket number 343, there will be
19 consequences, including but not limited to striking whatever
20 argument, striking footnotes, up to and possibly striking an
21 entire brief. I want to make sure everybody's on notice
22 because that was the issue of a hearing, and the Court said in
23 no uncertain terms and indicated what would be authorized and
24 what would not be authorized.

25 With that, the hearing on the 9019 motion concludes.

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

95

1 Ms. Fornos, you are the prevailing party. If you
2 would please upload an order within seven days via LOU that
3 just says, for the reasons stated on the record, the motion is
4 denied, that would be appreciated.

5 We will now be in recess. It's 12:13. We'll be in
6 recess till 1:15, when the Court will take up the other matters
7 in this case. Off the record.

8 (Recess from 12:13 p.m., until 1:15 p.m.)

9 THE COURT: Good afternoon, again. Calling matter
10 number 10 in the Zetta Jet matter, which is the Chapter 7
11 trustee's seventh motion under LBR 2016-2 for approval of cash
12 disbursements.

13 I see a number of people with their videos on. If
14 you're going to be arguing this motion, I'll ask that you keep
15 your video on. If you are not, then I'll ask you to turn off
16 your video.

17 I see Mr. Bovitz.

18 MR. BOVITZ: Yes, J. Scott Bovitz, Bovitz & Spitzer,
19 for the fee examiner, Nancy Rapaport.

20 THE COURT: Thank you.

21 Mr. Bernstein.

22 MR. BERNSTEIN: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Michael
23 Bernstein of Arnold & Porter on behalf of Universal Leader and
24 Glove Asset Investments.

25 THE COURT: Good afternoon.

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

96

1 Mr. Lyons.

2 MR. LYONS: Yes, Your Honor. John Lyons on behalf of
3 the trustee.

4 THE COURT: Good afternoon.

5 And Mr. King.

6 MR. KING: Good afternoon, Judge. It's John King, the
7 Chapter 7 trustee. I am present but will not be arguing.

8 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

9 So normally, these are very uncontroversial motions,
10 but obviously there was an objection filed by Universal Leader
11 and Glove Assets. And some of the issues raised by Universal
12 Leader, Glover Assets are concerns for the Court, and the Court
13 actually has other concerns.

14 I did issue an order yesterday asking for the
15 appraisal that's referenced. There was a response filed
16 indicating that the report contains highly sensitive
17 information that if publicly disclosed may adversely impact the
18 trustee's ability to maximize value for the estates.

19 Mr. Lyons, does that mean you can't give the Court a
20 figure?

21 MR. LYONS: Your Honor, that's part of the issue we
22 have. I mean, Your Honor, we will do with whatever Your Honor
23 orders, obviously, but we're heading into an auction, and to
24 disclose what that valuation number might be, Your Honor, might
25 basically impose a ceiling on other bidders. So it has a very

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

97

1 detrimental effect. We're a participant. We're a judgment
2 creditor. The bailiff is going to be selling the boat. But
3 disclosing that figure could kill bidding, and that's why we
4 wanted to talk to Your Honor first.

5 THE COURT: Okay. So I have a number of questions.
6 The motion indicates that you've been in discussions with the
7 Australian authorities regarding replacing the seizure warrant
8 with the judgment that this Court issued. And we are --
9 because it sounds like the auction is going forward, but there
10 was nothing in your motion that said when that would be or how
11 it would be or what would happen.

12 MR. LYONS: Yes, Your Honor, that's still ongoing.
13 We're working through DLA Australia with the Australia Federal
14 Police, and they're working on the mechanics to do that. So we
15 don't have a date yet. And we wanted to get this advance
16 authority from Your Honor so once it does go forward, we're
17 ready to go. But we don't have a date yet. It's still in
18 process.

19 THE COURT: Okay. So I'm certainly not an expert in
20 seizure warrants, but it appears that the District court here
21 issued the seizure warrant, and it was relayed to the
22 Australian authorities. Have you been in communication with
23 the parties who obtained the seizure warrant here to see if
24 they would be in agreement with what you're proposing that the
25 Australian authorities do?

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

98

1 MR. LYONS: Yes, we have, Your Honor. Right now, the
2 channel, though, is directly with the AFP because then they in
3 turn discuss it with the Department of Justice here in the U.S.

4 THE COURT: Okay. How much is the monthly storage
5 fee?

6 MR. LYONS: Boy, Your Honor, let me see this -- give
7 me one second.

8 MR. KING: If I could just interject for one second,
9 Your Honor. We have had discussions with the Department of
10 Justice ourselves. I don't want to get into the details unless
11 Your Honor requires it, but I also want that to be known.

12 THE COURT: That's fine. But it just seems to me the
13 Australian authorities are merely doing what the Department of
14 Justice are telling them to do. So it seems like you might not
15 be talking to the entity that issued the warrant. And I don't
16 think you were talking to the entity that issued the seizure
17 warrant. And it seems like discussions should be ongoing with
18 that entity, rather than the entity that's merely enforcing
19 that seizure warrant.

20 MR. KING: Yes.

21 THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Lyons, how much are the storage
22 fees?

23 MR. LYONS: Your Honor, I am trying to find it. I do
24 have the stay here. I know it's in this -- because it is an
25 issue that Mr. Lack did look at and believed to be reasonable.

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

99

1 THE COURT: Mr. who?

2 MR. KING: Mr. Lack, Your Honor. He's the Australian
3 Marine Surveyor who we noted in our --

4 THE COURT: Yes.

5 MR. LYONS: Well, I'll tell you what. I'd give it by
6 foot. It's \$2.48 per foot, Australian dollars, to store it per
7 day. So I'm trying to extrapolate that into the monthly fee.

8 I apologize, Your Honor. This isn't handy to me. It
9 requires some math, but let me see if I can --

10 THE COURT: All right. Well, I'll let you work on
11 that. I had other questions. What does that monthly storage
12 fee entail?

13 I'm just thinking, and this is an imperfect
14 comparison, but if I had a car that were sitting out for five
15 years, it would require significant maintenance before it could
16 be used. It would need -- the engine would need to turn over.
17 It would need to be maintained. And the yard is in salt water,
18 which is extremely corrosive, and ships and boats and yachts
19 need to be maintained. And I don't know what Morimoto
20 (phonetic) is doing for this yacht.

21 MR. LYONS: Your Honor, it's now out of the water
22 actually. It's in shrink wrap. So it's no longer -- it's no
23 longer in seawater. But Your Honor -- and I don't want to
24 reveal too much sensitive information, but Mr. Lack did take
25 into account the current state of the boat.

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

100

1 THE COURT: And that was that was my question. But
2 it's no longer sitting in the water?

3 MR. LYONS: Yes It is no longer sitting In the water,
4 correct. It sits on a dry dock, shrink-wrapped.

5 THE COURT: When was it removed from the water?

6 MR. LYONS: I believe it was -- and perhaps the
7 trustee has a better recollection, but I believe it was
8 beginning of this year or towards the end of last year. But it
9 was in the water for a period of time. And certainly, that
10 didn't enhance the value. I mean, it was purchased for over
11 3.4 million dollars back in 2017. So there has been some
12 degradation of value. But now, it's out of the water. And
13 certainly the valuation we have takes that into account.

14 THE COURT: And when you said beginning of this year
15 or end of last year, you're talking about beginning of 2023?

16 MR. LYONS: Yes, I believe so, Your Honor. That's
17 right.

18 THE COURT: So it was in the water from the beginning
19 of this case for basically five years?

20 MR. LYONS: It was. Since the time it was seized,
21 correct.

22 THE COURT: Okay. And was it maintained? Was someone
23 turning the engine over? Was someone doing what regular
24 maintenance of a boat in salt water needs to do?

25 MR. LYONS: We don't have direct information for that

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

101

1 because if Your Honor recalls, we were unable to obtain the
2 writ of attachment, and it remained in Linkage's name. So we
3 don't have a lot of visibility into actually what was happening
4 during that time frame.

5 But I don't believe it was being operated or the
6 engines run. I think it was just basically in the water being
7 stored until it was then removed from the water.

8 THE COURT: And the fees that you indicate are
9 currently owed are 225,000 dollars. That translates into U.S.
10 dollars of roughly 150,000. You're actually asking for 75,000
11 dollars more than what the current amount is.

12 MR. LYONS: Yeah, I guess, Your Honor, we wanted to
13 build in a little bit of buffer in case there are unforeseen
14 costs that we're unaware of, and also for perhaps a limited
15 time -- if we were to take title, judicial title. So there's a
16 little bit of buffer into that. We would obviously endeavor to
17 keep that as low as possible. And in the best of all worlds,
18 Your Honor, the boat will be sold at a price that the trustee
19 believes is within the range of market value.

20 THE COURT: And one thing that's troubling me about
21 this, Mr. Lyons, and I just don't understand. Assuming I were
22 to authorize the 225, okay, then you'd wait for the auction,
23 and then you would credit bid that, hypothetically, and --

24 MR. LYONS: (Indiscernible).

25 THE COURT: -- you would then have to turn around and

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

102

1 sell the boat, or the yacht, whatever you want to call it. So
2 why would you obtain more for the sale in a boat that's older
3 than the authorities will be obtaining when they do their
4 auction?

5 MR. LYONS: Well, Your Honor, I think part of it is
6 that we're not in direct control of the marketing process. The
7 judicial officer is. And if the bid -- if a bid would come in
8 for just the storage costs, Your Honor, it would be just
9 dramatically below the fair-market value. And it may well
10 be -- certainly, and Your Honor, this is where I don't want to
11 get into too much information because I think it -- I don't
12 know how we can do this, Your Honor, because certain of the
13 information, I think, falls into that highly sensitive
14 information that I think would not be for the benefit of the
15 estate.

16 THE COURT: Well --

17 MR. LYONS: More than just the number, Your Honor.
18 More than just the number of the fair-market value.

19 THE COURT: I understand your concerns about
20 confidentiality, Mr. Lyons, but the problem is I need to make
21 an informed decision. And right now, you're asking me to make
22 a decision based upon insufficient facts because you're saying
23 that the value is significantly higher. You haven't given me
24 anything to demonstrate that.

25 I don't know, and I'm going to take a recess for you

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

103

1 to calculate what the storage fees are, because assuming I
2 granted the motion, then you credit bid it, then you'd have to
3 store the yacht for the amount of time that you'd be marketing
4 it. And I looked at the Code provision that you cited, and it
5 looks like they generally market and sell property. You cited
6 the entire civil code, but I did look for the sale procedures
7 mechanism, and at least to me, at first blush, it looks like
8 they're going to do essentially what you do.

9 MR. LYONS: Your Honor, can I make a suggestion?

10 THE COURT: Certainly.

11 MR. LYONS: Because we want to get you this
12 information because I think this will definitely inform Your
13 Honor's decision on this. Would it be possible to file a
14 supplemental declaration, under seal, and the basis is this is
15 highly confidential commercial information going to the bidding
16 for the boat. If Your Honor disagrees that it should be under
17 seal, you'll certainly deny the motion, and we can file it.
18 But at least it will give you the information, Your Honor. And
19 certainly, at the conclusion of the auction, don't need to seal
20 it anymore. This is just a very temporarily limited sensitive
21 information.

22 But I think it will inform Your Honor on the issues
23 that you're raising. I'm trying to think of a way here, Your
24 Honor, to not divulge that information because I think once I
25 reveal it, Your Honor will understand why I'm so sensitive

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

104

1 about revealing this.

2 THE COURT: Well, in terms of an appraisal, and again,
3 I've never been involved with the sale of a seventy-foot yacht,
4 but I would assume anybody bidding on it would get their own
5 appraisal before they bid on it, or do people bid on these
6 things sight-unseen and they just assume it's going to have a
7 certain value?

8 MR. LYONS: Well, no, Your Honor, but if you're a
9 bidder and someone knows what your number is, they're not going
10 to bid a penny over it. And I need to stop there because I'd
11 love to add more and you'd see it in a proper context but -- I
12 mean, Your Honor, listen, if you're requiring that, I'll lay it
13 out. But I think it would be potentially detrimental to the
14 ultimate values that we're going to be able to recover.

15 THE COURT: Well, let's do this, Mr. Lyons. Nobody
16 has objected to, nor does the Court have the objection to, the
17 50,000 you're asking for enforcement expenses and the 50,000
18 that you're seeking of the other expenses. I don't believe Mr.
19 Bernstein has objected, and there's been no objection by any
20 other party. So those are authorized.

21 If you want to continue with this request for the
22 Court to authorize 225,000 to pay off Morimoto, even though the
23 amount is 151,000, I'm not sure where the buffer would come in.
24 And that's why I was asking what are the monthly storage fees
25 to have a better idea of, well, maybe if the auction didn't

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

105

1 happen for a year, maybe that's where that was coming in. But
2 you weren't able to give me that information readily, although
3 I'm sure you can.

4 So I'll authorize the 100,000 dollars, as I stated.
5 And if you want to pursue the 225, then it's going to have to
6 be explained in much more detail than it is here.

7 MR. LYONS: Understood, Your Honor. Could I suggest
8 this as to get a holding date? We could file a supplemental
9 declaration. We'll make sure and have unredacted the storage
10 costs, everything else that isn't very sensitive, and we'll get
11 that number to you.

12 But the sensitive information, we're going to -- we'd
13 propose we file a motion to file it under seal, and we file an
14 unredacted copy with Your Honor but on the docket, a redacted
15 copy. And then, Your Honor, you can decide whether you're
16 going to grant the motion to seal or not. And then we could
17 continue the portion for the credit-bid cost over to -- at a
18 next date -- there's no urgency right now. There hasn't been
19 an auction date set. I'm trying to figure out the best
20 procedural way to do this, but I --

21 THE COURT: Well, I think the best procedural
22 mechanism, Mr. Lyons, is as you said, there is no urgency.
23 There is no auction date set. I assume, an auction date today,
24 they aren't going to see the auction's tomorrow. I would
25 assume that they would want to get the best and highest bid,

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

106

1 and there might be at least a few weeks, if not a month, where
2 the auction is publicized if it's anything like auctions of
3 seized goods in the U.S. And then in that situation, you can
4 come back and you can provide admissible evidence that the
5 Court can consider in terms of whether or not it should
6 authorize what you were asking for.

7 MR. LYONS: Yeah, sure. And I just want to let Your
8 Honor know in advance, some of that information, we're going to
9 request be kept under seal until the conclusion of the auction,
10 and we'll file the appropriate motion for that for Your Honor's
11 consideration and redact that information in the public
12 version. And then the remainder of the supplemental
13 declaration outlining the storage costs, we would then -- that
14 would be in the public version that would be filed.

15 THE COURT: And just to --

16 MR. TOROSIAN: So just to be clear, Your Honor -- Jeff
17 Torosian for the trustee -- it's more than just under seal. It
18 has to be -- if Your Honor would entertain in-camera review, ex
19 parte in-camera review, or at the very least, limited to
20 attorney's-eyes only, because this is main-case stuff with
21 parties who may -- we can't keep it from the parties if it's
22 filed under seal. That doesn't really get us the protections
23 we need.

24 We would need something even more than that, which
25 would be attorney's-eyes only. Maybe that might get us there.

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

107

1 But anything short of that, we're hurting value. And we're
2 getting very close to the line, I'm saying too much now, by
3 hurting value, and that just hurts creditors. So we have to be
4 very careful on even filing it under seal. That might not in
5 and of itself be enough. It probably needs to be AEO
6 protections as well.

7 THE COURT: Well -- yes, Mr. Bovitz.

8 MR. BOVITZ: Your Honor, J. Scott Bovitz for Nancy
9 Rapoport.

10 We don't need to have a party on the boat, but one of
11 the ways that the Court has reviewed expenses of professionals
12 in this case is they're attached to fee applications, and the
13 fee examiner reviews the application, the expenses, has
14 discussion and dialog. And if the expenses were being advanced
15 by DLA with respect to a mediator, she cares. Professor
16 Rapaport will have something to say and have a discussion.

17 With respect to boat storage charges, she's not sure
18 whether she's supposed to play a role in that. It's an expense
19 of the estate. But it is an expense, and it's something where
20 she could, confidentially or otherwise -- I don't know about
21 the seal issues; I don't have any opinion -- but she could
22 review this if the Court wants her to.

23 But we don't want to -- she doesn't want to step out
24 of her lane. If her lane is review expenses, including boat
25 charges, dock charges, and so forth, she will, and she'll be

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

108

1 happy to give her opinion. That may help on this. I don't
2 know. We would love some instruction from the Court.

3 THE COURT: Thank you. I appreciate that, Mr. Bovitz.

4 I want to see what the storage charges are. I need
5 more information. That's all I can say, Mr. Lyons.

6 MR. LYONS: Yeah, we --

7 THE COURT: How you choose to get it to me is up to
8 you --

9 MR. LYONS: Okay.

10 THE COURT: -- but you are asking me blindly to say,
11 here's 225,000 dollars that you may or may not use, and trust
12 me, it's going to generate more funds for the estate. And as I
13 said, to me, if you credit -- if I gave you the funds and if
14 you credit bid, then you haven't provided any basis to
15 substantiate that you would be likely to get more funds than
16 what the auction would generate, and you would definitely be
17 incurring more expenses because you'd have to pay the storage
18 fees every month. So that's why the storage fees were
19 important to the Court as well.

20 So I'm going to grant the two 50,000 figures, the
21 50,000 in terms of enforcement expenses, the 50,000 in terms of
22 other expenses. I'm going to deny the 225 without prejudice.
23 If you want to bring it, you can try to bring it in whatever
24 way you think is appropriate. But I'm going to deny it right
25 now, so I don't think it's worthwhile to expend more funds to

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

109

1 file a declaration now. I would wait until there's actually.
2 An auction because it may never happen this year. You're
3 discussing it. It may not happen.

4 MR. LYONS: Yeah, Your Honor, because we don't control
5 it. But okay, I'll tell you. Okay, Your Honor. Understood.
6 We will act accordingly. If for whatever reason, though, this
7 auction gets scheduled quickly, we may be back in front of you
8 on an emergency basis. And I hate to do that.

9 THE COURT: And I understand that. And I understand
10 that, but if you know the auction is scheduled on March 1st and
11 the auction is scheduled for April 15th and you bring your
12 emergency motion on April 7th, the Court isn't going to look
13 kindly on that, right?

14 MR. LYONS: I understand.

15 THE COURT: So you need to be the one to bring this to
16 the Court in a timely manner. If you bring it on shortened
17 notice, and I want when you bring it on shortened notice, if
18 that's the issue, you need to file a declaration signed under
19 penalty of perjury the day that you learned when the auction
20 would be. Because I don't want there to be gamesmanship. I
21 don't want it to be, oh, we don't need to do it now. We'll get
22 in on shortened notice.

23 There needs to be a demonstrated reason in the record
24 why it needs to be on shortened notice. And if you find out
25 about it on March 1st and the auction is six weeks away, I

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

110

1 don't consider that any reason to file it on shortened notice.

2 You have sufficient time to put it on regular notice.

3 MR. TOROSIAN: Judge --

4 MR. LYONS: Okay.

5 MR. TOROSIAN: -- (indiscernible) Your Honor. And
6 again, I don't know who we'd be gaming in this situation, and
7 certainly, we don't game anyone in anything we do. But just to
8 be clear, we're still not addressing the confidentiality issue.

9 THE COURT: Well, you're going to have --

10 MR. TOROSIAN: Does Your Honor have a view for --
11 because once we do that on shortened notice, emergency notice,
12 regular notice, doesn't matter, you're going to want to see
13 what we're telling you right now we're going to have difficulty
14 showing you. And so I'd prefer if we had a solution to that
15 now, rather than just addressing this and incurring the ire of
16 the Court when we're facing down an auction. Because it's
17 going to be even worse then, because then bidders are getting
18 ready to bid and they're going to know what our thinking of
19 value is if we file something that's disclosed to the public,
20 or even just the parties to this main case.

21 THE COURT: Well, Mr. Torosian, I'll leave it to you
22 and Mr. Lyons how you propose to proceed. We'll take a recess.

23 I also do want to know what the storage fees are, Mr.
24 Lyons.

25 MR. LYONS: Yes.

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

111

1 THE COURT: And during that recess, you can provide a
2 figure when we come back. And then you can propose, and then
3 we can talk about it.

4 Just so everybody knows, I have a hard stop at 2:30.
5 If we're not done at 2:30, we'll have to pick this up either
6 tomorrow afternoon or another day.

7 So I want to move on to the other matters on calendar
8 in terms -- we'll come back to this after a recess with a
9 proposal from Mr. Torosian and/or Mr. Lyons about how to deal
10 with the issues of confidentiality that they indicate prohibit
11 them from filing on the docket the --

12 MR. TOROSIAN: I don't want to belabor the point, Your
13 Honor, but that is the suggestion that we file it under seal
14 with AEO protections at the time that we're ready to proceed
15 with the auction. That is our suggested solution, and we're
16 willing to entertain comments from Mr. Bernstein or others as
17 to that.

18 But we're obviously happy to have Your Honor look at
19 it, we're happy to have counsel of record look at it, but not
20 parties (indiscernible) --

21 MR. LYONS: Right, and --

22 MR. TOROSIAN: -- proposed solution.

23 MR. LYONS: -- then Mr. Bernstein represents the only
24 objector. So we certainly can provide it to Mr. Bernstein
25 attorneys'-eyes only if that would satisfy some concerns.

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

112

1 THE COURT: Well, let me hear from Mr. Bernstein.

2 MR. BERNSTEIN: Yes, Your Honor. Thank you.

3 So look, with respect to information that in good
4 faith is properly designated as highly confidential, that
5 portion of what they're going to file, I'm fine with
6 attorneys'-eyes-only. I think that's a reasonable way to deal
7 with that portion of what they're going to file, not a whole
8 motion, but that portion, which in good faith is reasonably
9 designated as highly confidential.

10 As a general matter, attorneys'-eyes only is
11 obviously, as the Court, very problematic because we consult
12 with our clients to develop positions in litigation. And if we
13 can't consult with our clients, that is fighting a battle with
14 both arms behind our back. But if it is limited to what is in
15 good faith properly designated as highly confidential
16 information, the disclosure of which would damage the estate,
17 then on that basis, I think attorneys'-eyes only in this
18 particular contested matter is reasonable, and it would be --
19 and it would be acceptable to us.

20 THE COURT: And the other issue that will be raised, I
21 expect, is that other counsel who didn't object to the 2016
22 motion will want to see it as well.

23 So Mr. Torosian, is your proposal only to provide it
24 to Mr. Bernstein or to all counsel who want --

25 MR. TOROSIAN: No, I said all counsel of record, but I

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

113

1 mean, this is main case. We'd have to go through the list of
2 who that would be.

3 MR. LYONS: Yeah, it would be unwieldy, Your Honor.

4 MR. TOROSIAN: It might be dozens of people. And it's
5 just --

6 THE COURT: So then who --

7 MR. TOROSIAN: And it's just -- first of all --

8 THE COURT: Mr. Torosian, who would you propose that
9 you provide it to, then? If it's going to be unwieldy -- you
10 said all counsel of record, but then Mr. Lyons said something
11 different. So what are you proposing in terms of who you --
12 because this is where we start getting into issues.

13 MR. TOROSIAN: Right.

14 THE COURT: So Mr. Lyons or Mr. Torosian, who do you
15 propose that it be presented to?

16 MR. LYONS: Your Honor, I would propose certainly Mr.
17 Maroko, the U.S. trustee's office, Mr. Bernstein, who raised an
18 objection to the cash management order. We'd provide one to
19 the fee examiner too. That wouldn't be any issue.

20 Your Honor, we could reach out to Bombardier and
21 CAVIC. They seem to be the only other parties here who are
22 really involved, as well as Jetcraft. But again, I think
23 really the only objector, here, is Mr. Bernstein to the relief.
24 So the broader we -- attorneys'-eyes only, look, we have fine
25 counsel. I have no doubt that they're going to adhere to

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

114

1 confidentiality. But I'm just wondering if it's just going to
2 add that one bit of confidential, sensitive information that
3 Your Honor raised regarding the report.

4 THE COURT: Well, I think because of the nature of
5 this litigation, I do believe you need to present it to Mr.
6 Bernstein, CAVIC, Bombardier. I'm not seeing anybody from
7 Jetcraft, FK, but I assume they would want to see it as well.
8 The fee examiner, Mr. Maroko, and me, of course.

9 MR. BOVITZ: Your Honor.

10 THE COURT: Yes.

11 MR. BOVITZ: J. Scott Bovitz for the fee examiner. If
12 you don't want the fee examiner to weigh in on this, don't pass
13 the secret information to us where they can torture the fee
14 examiner and get the details. No, I'm kidding about the
15 torture part. But if you want her input, yes, then we need the
16 information. So the Court needs to, please, do you want her
17 assistance or not her assistance on this?

18 THE COURT: On this, I do not believe so. So thank
19 you for raising that, Mr. Bovitz. And thank you --

20 MR. BOVITZ: Thank you.

21 THE COURT: -- Prof. Rapoport.

22 MR. TOROSIAN: And just to be clear, Your Honor,
23 obviously, we'd be happy to have the examiner look at it, or
24 either way is fine with us. I don't think she's in the market
25 for a yacht like this, but maybe, you never know. But I assume

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

115

1 when we just went through that litany of parties, those are
2 just counsel for those parties because it would be AEO.

3 THE COURT: That's correct. It would be --

4 MR. TOROSIAN: Great, and --

5 THE COURT: -- counsel for those parties.

6 MR. TOROSIAN: And we're okay with that, and we would
7 obviously file this at the appropriate time when we have a date
8 for the auction. And then we'll file a declaration in
9 conjunction with that as to when exactly we learned of the date
10 of the auction.

11 THE COURT: Correct.

12 Mr. Bovitz.

13 MR. BOVITZ: Your Honor, if there's going to be a
14 disclosure to the fee examiner, don't give it to me. Give it
15 to the fee examiner. And that way, we'll skip me because I
16 can't not have a communication with someone if her input was
17 interested. The Court has indicated no, so please, Mr.
18 Torosian's offer is incredibly fine and nice, but don't give it
19 to us because there's no need if she's not going to give an
20 input and there's no reason to have an additional potential
21 leakage of the secret information.

22 THE COURT: All right. So please do not provide it to
23 Prof. Rappaport.

24 MR. LYONS: Okay.

25 THE COURT: All right. So Mr. Torosian, would you

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

116

1 please read out the names of the attorneys for the parties who
2 you will be providing it to so there is no confusion.

3 MR. TOROSIAN: Your Honor, I wasn't writing it down,
4 and I don't have all their names handy --

5 MR. LYONS: I can --

6 MR. TOROSIAN: -- but were you doing it, Mr. Lyons?

7 MR. LYONS: Yeah. Yeah, I could. Well, since
8 they're -- I see them on the call. How about Ms. Fornos for
9 Bombardier, Mr. Ciatti from Jetcraft, Mr. Bernstein, of course,
10 for Universal Leader, and Mr. Maroko and --

11 THE COURT: Ms. Azlin for CAVIC?

12 MR. LYONS: -- Ms. Azlin. Ms. Azlin, right, for
13 CAVIC.

14 THE COURT: Hold on. And the Court?

15 MR. LYONS: Yes, and the Court.

16 THE COURT: Okay. And Jetcraft and the FK defendants,
17 they're represented by the same counsel; is that correct?

18 MR. LYONS: Yes.

19 THE COURT: Okay. So providing it to Mr. Ciatti would
20 provide it to Jetcraft -- and Mr. Ciatti just turned his video
21 on, and he's nodding yes. Okay.

22 MR. CIATTI: Yes. Yes, Your Honor. Thank you.

23 THE COURT: I just wanted to make sure that we didn't
24 come back here with one party saying they were not privy to the
25 information.

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

117

1 MR. CIATTI: Understood.

2 THE COURT: Okay.

3 MR. CIATTI: Thank you, Your Honor.

4 THE COURT: Okay.

5 MR. LYONS: And Your Honor, I'll make sure to sign a
6 declaration of that effect.

7 THE COURT: Okay. All right. So I think we've solved
8 that issue, but right now we don't have to address it because
9 again, we don't know when or if that auction is going to take
10 place. So in terms of the ruling -- and I did see you wanting
11 to speak, Mr. Bernstein, just one moment -- I'm going to grant
12 as to the 50,000 and the 50,000 and deny without prejudice the
13 other request.

14 MR. TOROSIAN: Thank you, Your Honor.

15 THE COURT: Thank you.

16 Mr. Bernstein.

17 MR. BERNSTEIN: Thank you, Your Honor. Just two quick
18 points.

19 One is just a clarification that I assume goes without
20 saying, but so Mr. Lyons read out a name of individual
21 attorneys. I assume that I'll be permitted to share this with
22 my colleagues at Arnold & Porter who are also working with me
23 on the Zetta Jet matter.

24 THE COURT: That's my understanding, but Mr. Lyons.

25 MR. LYONS: Well, why don't I speak in terms of the

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

118

1 law firm, then, Your Honor?

2 MR. BERNSTEIN: Yeah.

3 THE COURT: I think that's a better way of doing it.

4 MR. BERNSTEIN: Yeah. Yeah, that would be good.

5 MR. LYONS: Counsel for CAVIC, counsel for Bombardier.

6 THE COURT: I think that's appropriate.

7 MR. BERNSTEIN: Great. Thanks.

8 The only other issue is, and I'm happy to have the
9 Court this on or not take this up as Your Honor chooses, but
10 just given the comments that the Court and Mr. Lyons made about
11 timing issues, as the Court knows, it is our view that if the
12 trustee elects to purchase the yacht -- to make a credit bid to
13 purchase the yacht, that that requires court approval because
14 it's an out of the ordinary course use of estate assets. And I
15 think they'd be credit bidding not only storage charges but
16 their lien or up to the full amount of the lien.

17 And I'm prepared to argue that point if necessary.
18 I'm happy not to argue it right now since you've ruled for
19 today. The reason I'm mentioning it is we're talking about
20 possibility of future dates, of scheduling, and Mr. Lyons said
21 he might come in on an expedited notice to reseek these storage
22 fees. And I just want it on the Court's radar that at least in
23 our view, it's clear that under the applicable case law, not
24 only is the paying storage fees require court approval, but
25 buying a giant yacht requires court approval as well.

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

119

1 And again, I just want to mention that, and we can
2 address it now or address it later today or address it sometime
3 in the future. And I leave that to Your Honor.

4 THE COURT: It may be a nonissue because again, we're
5 trying to read the tea leaves about when this auction might
6 take place and what will happen.

7 But Mr. Lyons, if you care to weigh in and respond to
8 that, I'd be interested in hearing your response.

9 MR. LYONS: Oh, well, Your Honor, I think, look, we
10 have a judgment that Your Honor issued, and we're trying to
11 enforce it in a foreign country, in Australia, and there's a
12 judicial sale. I mean, I'm not sure what remedy we would have.
13 Would we have -- would we have some kind of cross-border
14 communication while the auction is going? Because prices move
15 up, and they move down. We have a five-million-dollar
16 judgment.

17 So I'm not sure how, mechanically, that would work
18 because it's on the other side of the world. If we get into an
19 auction, it prevents a lot of issues. The trustee, it has its
20 business judgment. And he's going to have additional
21 authorization to maintain the boat, or then we're back in front
22 of Your Honor. So I'm just not sure how exactly that would
23 work.

24 I mean, we could set up a cross-border, some kind of,
25 like, hearing. But that's going to be pretty problematic.

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

120

1 THE COURT: Mr. Bernstein.

2 MR. BERNSTEIN: Yeah, for sure I wasn't envisioning
3 the Court staying up in the middle of the night in real-time
4 with the clanging of boats in the background.

5 But the point is that if under the case law and
6 ordinary-course use of estate assets is something that a
7 company, either this company or comparable companies, does in
8 the everyday, ordinary, typical course of its business
9 operations, the Ninth Circuit case law refers to the vertical
10 test, which means what this company typically does day in and
11 day out, or the horizontal test is what other comparable,
12 similar companies in the same business do day in and day out,
13 things like retailers selling their inventory to customers or
14 airlines selling tickets or paying landing fees or buying fuel
15 and paying FEOs and so forth. And that's ordinary course.

16 And this is just -- this is just not ordinary course,
17 buying a giant seventy-foot allegedly-multimillion-dollar
18 yacht, whether it's by credit bid or by cash, is not something
19 that a charter jet company, or particularly a defunct charter
20 jet company that's not operating a business, does every day in
21 the ordinary course.

22 Other cases within this circuit say ordinary course
23 means something that a creditor doing business with this
24 company would expect the company to be doing day in and day out
25 as a normal course of its business. And a creditor of a

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

121

1 charter jet company or a defunct chart company, either way, I
2 wouldn't expect the company to be -- it would be selling block
3 hours, if it were still operating, and paying its pilots and
4 wages and so forth. It wouldn't be buying seventy-foot yachts.
5 So we think it's really clear under the case law that this is
6 not ordinary course.

7 That doesn't mean that -- well, let me say this. It's
8 even more true in this case for a reason that Your Honor
9 mentioned, which is that when you buy this yacht for a credit
10 bid, if they buy it, you're necessarily taking on a whole host
11 of other expenses. We've focused in the little discussion
12 today on storage expenses, and Your Honor properly raised the
13 question of it's not just these 225 or 150,000, but it's the
14 future storage expenses for who knows how long until they
15 resell out the boat, if they're able to resell the boat.

16 But it's other stuff. It's security and it's
17 maintenance and it's insurance and it's cost of marketing and
18 sale and so forth. And once you buy the bulk, you're
19 necessarily taking those things on. The trustee says, we'll
20 come back to the Court, but what's the Court going to do once
21 you have a boat there? If you buy the boat, you're
22 necessarily -- so it's not only a big credit bid of an out-of-
23 the-ordinary-course nature, but you're necessarily then taking
24 on a bunch of other expenses, the amount of which we don't
25 know. And that's why Your Honor sought the monthly charge

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

122

1 information for storage, but there's a lot of other stuff
2 besides storage when you own a boat.

3 And so it seems very clear to me that this is out of
4 the ordinary course. And that's why we raised this, because
5 the only stated purpose of paying the 225,000, or 150,000,
6 whatever it is, if you use U.S. dollars, is because the trustee
7 says, well, if we make the credit bid and buy the boat, we're
8 going to have to pay those storage charges. I mean, there's no
9 evidence to support that so I don't know if it's true or not,
10 but that's what they say.

11 But anyway, if the only purpose of paying the \$225,000
12 in accrued storage charges is in connection with buying the
13 boat, and if buying the boat, as we believe, requires court
14 approval, then it doesn't make any sense for the Court to
15 authorize 225,000 dollars in storage charges before the Court
16 has even been asked to approve the out-of-the-ordinary-course
17 purchase of the boat. It's putting the cart before the horse.

18 Now, I'm not saying with all of this that the trustee
19 could not meet the legal standard to convince Your Honor to
20 authorize the purchase of the boat. You'd have to -- there's a
21 bunch of issues because right now, they haven't even sought
22 that so they haven't presented any evidence. So what is the
23 boat worth, then.

24 As Your Honor asked, what makes anybody think they're
25 going to be able to -- the trustee is going to be able to sell

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

123

1 it more afterward after they own it than it's going to sell for
2 at the auction where it's being marketed and how long is it
3 going to take to sell and what are the costs of sale and how
4 much is this future storage charges, not the 225, and how much
5 are the maintenance costs and the security costs and the
6 insurance costs and balance that all against the benefit to the
7 estate of buying this yacht.

8 And I don't know, maybe they can meet the standard,
9 but for now, they haven't presented any evidence, and they
10 haven't even asked Your Honor to approve it. And so that's why
11 I raised this issue because if they're just asking you to
12 authorize the 225,000, then I think that doesn't make any sense
13 without seeking and obtaining approval to make a credit bid
14 because that would be the only purpose.

15 So I think if they're going to seek renewed approval
16 to seek approval to pay the accrued past storage charges, first
17 of all, we should get the number right, without fudge factors
18 and whatever you call it, extra dollars baked in. We should
19 get the number right, but then they should also, at the same
20 time or prior to that, seek approval to make a credit bid
21 because they need that approval in order to do it. And if they
22 don't get that approval, then paying the storage charges
23 doesn't make any sense at all, by their own reasoning.

24 THE COURT: Mr. Lyons.

25 MR. LYONS: Your Honor, if I may respond. Your Honor,

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

124

1 this is not -- this is a judgment. Mr. Bernstein has cited no
2 cases in support of the proposition that a trustee before
3 executing a judgment against an asset to recover an asset needs
4 court approval. That's what we're doing here. We are going to
5 recover this boat to have title.

6 Now, we're going to be looking at the auction and
7 trying to -- if we can get a good price out of it, then we're
8 going to -- then the trustee and his exercises business
9 judgment, we'll take it. But if we would have title to the
10 boat, Your Honor, then no question, if we would have to -- if
11 we would resell it, we would then -- it would be subject to
12 Your Honor's higher or better 363.

13 But right now, we're just executing a judgment. I
14 mean, as Mr. Bernstein's suggesting, if we have a judgment
15 against, okay, Mr. Wu, who entered the judgment against, are we
16 supposed to hold off on executing that judgment in a foreign
17 jurisdiction to recover a valuable asset? That's not what the
18 Code says. And he's cited no case to say that you need 363
19 approval to execute a judgment that Your Honor -- that Your
20 Honor (indiscernible). It would hamstring the trustees
21 worldwide when they're in foreign jurisdictions to recover
22 assets.

23 THE COURT: Okay. So this isn't before me right now.
24 Obviously, this is a peripheral issue for what was addressed in
25 the 2016 motion.

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

125

1 Mr. Lyons, you're on notice that Mr. Bernstein is
2 likely to raise this when/if you file the motion to pay the
3 storage fees, and so you can address it at that point. Mr.
4 Bernstein, you can respond. And then the Court will have an
5 opportunity to weigh in on it. But right now, I don't have
6 that before me, and I'm not going to opine on something that
7 neither side has briefed and I haven't had a chance to analyze
8 or review the law on.

9 So anyway, in terms of what's before me, I'm granting
10 the 2016 motion for the 50,000, 50,000. I am denying without
11 prejudice the 225. And we've already talked about how that
12 needs to be brought again.

13 But I do again want to caution, if you are going to
14 seek relief on an expedited basis, there has to be a
15 declaration signed under penalty of perjury explaining exactly
16 when you found out about the date of the auction and why you
17 waited a week, two weeks, three weeks and why it needs to be
18 held on shortened notice. Because just coming in saying the
19 auction is next week, that is not going to be persuasive.

20 Okay. All right. So that's it on the 2016 motion.

21 I did want to say one other thing. There's an issue
22 that was raised in terms of the 9019 motion. It was raised
23 again by Mr. Bernstein in opposition or in response to the
24 2016. It's regarding treating Zetta USA and Zetta Singapore's
25 estate as one. Universal Leader highlights that there are two

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

126

1 separate debtors, two separate estates with separate assets and
2 liabilities.

3 The trustee responds that the Court authorized him to
4 use one debtor-in-possession account. That misses the point in
5 the context of a first-day emergency motion in the then-Chapter
6 11 to authorize the continued use of debtors' cash-management
7 system. In authorizing the maintenance of pre-petition bank
8 accounts, the Court granted the trustee authority to have the
9 debtors' accounts receivable be deposited from the DIP account
10 into two others, one for general payables and one for payroll.

11 Nowhere in that motion, which was docket 23, or the
12 order, docket 368, was the Court asked or did the Court rule
13 that the debtors do not have to maintain separate accountings
14 of assets and liability. So I want to make sure everybody's on
15 the same page. Saying that I authorized it in that order,
16 which was a first-day motion, is not correct. Okay.

17 I don't believe any more argument is necessary. Mr.
18 Lyons, if there's something you'd like to say, you're welcome
19 to, but I think we're pretty much done with that.

20 MR. LYONS: There is certainly accounting for all the
21 moneys received, Your Honor. And we laid it out, I think, in
22 my previous reply, where ninety-five percent of the proceeds
23 arise from the settlements we've had in the adversary actions.
24 So ultimately people will be able to object or frankly, review
25 what a proposed distribution would be based upon those

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

127

1 settlements. It really is those settlements accounts that took
2 the assets of the estate.

3 THE COURT: But again, I don't think that's the issue
4 raised by Mr. Bernstein. The issue raised by Mr. Bernstein is
5 there's the fifteen-million-dollar element settlement, how much
6 should be allocated to Zetta USA and how much -- the fact they
7 came in --

8 MR. LYONS: Right.

9 THE COURT: -- from three or four settlements, I don't
10 think that's looking at it on the opposite end. It's what
11 estate, USA or Singapore, is the one that should receive those
12 funds. So I think it's a different focus, Mr. Lyons.

13 MR. LYONS: Yes, and ultimately, the trustee will
14 propose the allocation and Mr. Bernstein and others can object
15 and Your Honor will determine what the allocation should be.
16 But I mean, I guess to do it now, the money's in the door. I
17 mean, we will. If Your Honor would like us to move for
18 substantive consolidation, if that's the right remedy, or if
19 the --

20 THE COURT: I'm not telling you, Mr. Lyons, how to
21 address the case. I'm not telling you how to handle the case.
22 I'm not saying it should or it shouldn't be substantively
23 consolidated. All I'm saying is indicating that the Court
24 authorized you not to keep separate accounting of the assets
25 and liabilities of the two debtors based upon an order that was

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

128

1 entered in a first-day motion is not an accurate statement of
2 what was before the Court or what the Court ruled in that
3 order. I just want to make sure we're all on the same page of
4 that. Okay. Thank you.

5 MR. LYONS: Understood, Your Honor.

6 THE COURT: All right. Hold on.

7 THE COURT: Yes, Mr. Torosian. Oh, Mr. Bovitz.

8 MR. BOVITZ: Mr. Bovitz.

9 THE COURT: Mr. Bovitz.

10 MR. BOVITZ: We look the same.

11 Your Honor, the fee examiner shares the concern, but
12 from an administrative and accounting standpoint, because if a
13 professional is doing work with respect to Zetta Jet Singapore,
14 as you will call it, or Zetta Jet USA, they should be allocated
15 and billed and authorized accordingly. Otherwise, it may
16 already be a nightmare kind of as we get to final fee
17 applications.

18 But it is time for professionals to consider whether
19 they should be billing just to a single Zetta Jet account or to
20 the respective estates. And the Court may wish in the future
21 to hear the fee examiner's report. And of course, that also
22 means that with respect to what's appropriate work, what's
23 reasonable for that at the time when incurred makes sense with
24 respect to USA versus Singapore.

25 So I don't know when. There's no motion for

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

129

1 substantive consolidation before the Court. You raised the
2 issue. I wanted to share the examiner's concern.

3 THE COURT: I appreciate that, Mr. Bovitz. Thank you.
4 And you're right, there is nothing before the Court, but it's
5 been raised at least two times by Mr. Bernstein, I believe.

6 And it's something that's not going to go away, Mr.
7 Lyons. How you get a ruling on it, I don't know, and I'm
8 certainly not saying. Whether it's okay to wait until the
9 absolute end of these cases, I don't know. But that seems to
10 be what you're planning to do, and I don't know whether that is
11 or isn't appropriate. That's all I'm saying. It's your case.
12 You have to deal with it. And you know it's an issue that's
13 not going to go away is best I can say.

14 I just wanted to make sure there was no
15 misunderstanding of what was asked in the first-day motion and
16 there's no misunderstanding of what was before the Court and
17 there's no misunderstanding of what the court's order meant.
18 And it absolutely did not say that the debtors did not have to
19 maintain separate accountings of their assets and their
20 liabilities.

21 So I think we've said plenty regarding that. Moving
22 on to the next matter on calendar is the status conference in
23 King v. Jetcraft.

24 Mr. Lyons, how do you wish to proceed?

25 MR. LYONS: Your Honor, I think I'll let Mr. Torosian

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

130

1 address the next steps.

2 THE COURT: Mr. Torosian.

3 MR. TOROSIAN: Yeah, Your Honor, we're going to have
4 to circle back with Mr. Ciatti on the one hand to see if, given
5 your ruling -- first of all, we have to digest your ruling.
6 Secondly, we have to circle back with Mr. Ciatti to see if
7 there is a settlement to salvage.

8 We're going to have to circle back with Judge Gross to
9 see if he's even willing to consider further mediation of this
10 or if he's so insulted by the parties' arguments to this that
11 he doesn't want anything to do with it. I don't know the
12 answer to that. I can see the latter being a strong
13 possibility.

14 We're going to have to consider what we're doing as a
15 law firm because right now, we're owed fifteen million dollars,
16 and we're basically being forced to proceed with a case that
17 I'm not sure the parties even want to proceed with at this
18 point. So we have a lot to digest. I have to talk to my
19 senior leadership at my firm, my CEO and managing partner. We
20 have to talk to the parties. We have to talk to Judge Gross.

21 So I suggest -- the good news is I don't think I've
22 heard Your Honor or Bombardier's counsel speak so highly of our
23 claims against Bombardier until today, so I think we all know
24 those claims are coming back from appeal. But regardless, we
25 need to get through all of that and then circle back to Your

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

131

1 Honor and tell Your Honor what we think we should do. And we'd
2 ask for a two-week continuance to report back to Your Honor on
3 status.

4 THE COURT: Okay. So today is February 15th. You're
5 suggesting that we come back on March 1st so you can report how
6 you intend to proceed; is that what you're suggesting, Mr.
7 Torosian?

8 MR. TOROSIAN: If that meets with Mr. Ciatti, because
9 he's a party to this as well, if that meets with
10 his scheduling --

11 THE COURT: Mr. Ciatti.

12 MR. CIATTI: Thank you, Your Honor. Michael Ciatti on
13 behalf of the Jetcraft and FK defendants.

14 I mean, I agree that there are a lot -- a lot needs to
15 be done, and I do have some concern that trying to do it in two
16 weeks is reasonable. And so I don't want to come back to the
17 Court with a nonreport, so I guess I would suggest we might
18 need a little bit more time, just to make it a productive next
19 session so --

20 THE COURT: I agree. I agree. So hold on one sec.
21 Let me check another calendar.

22 Let's go to March 22nd. Does that work? I'll just go
23 around and ask everybody I see on screen.

24 Mr. Bovitz.

25 MR. BOVITZ: Fine, Your Honor.

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

132

1 THE COURT: Mr. Lyons.

2 MR. LYONS: Yes, that works.

3 THE COURT: Mr. King.

4 MR. KING: Yes, Judge.

5 THE COURT: Prof. Rapoport.

6 PROF. RAPOPORT: Your Honor, except for something
7 that's probably going to happen between 9 and 10, it works for
8 me, but Mr. Bovitz can cover it for me if he's available.

9 THE COURT: Mr. Bovitz.

10 MR. BOVITZ: I'm available on the 22nd, Your Honor.

11 THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Torosian.

12 MR. TOROSIAN: I'm available. But Your Honor, this is
13 just for status of Jetcraft. I don't think we need the fee
14 examiner and fee examiner counsel for that hearing, but I'm
15 happy --

16 THE COURT: Okay.

17 MR. TOROSIAN: -- happy to have them attend if you
18 think we do.

19 THE COURT: I don't believe so, but I wanted to give
20 everybody an opportunity to be heard.

21 Mr. Ciatti.

22 MR. CIATTI: Your Honor, the 22nd works. Thank you.

23 THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Bernstein. I don't know if you
24 wish to be heard.

25 MR. BERNSTEIN: That's fine. If we participate, I'll

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

133

1 be on or one of my colleagues will be available.

2 THE COURT: Okay. And just in case the fee examiner
3 does want to participate, I'll say March 22nd at 10. So that
4 way, you don't feel excluded, Professor.

5 PROF. RAPOPORT: Thank you, Your Honor.

6 THE COURT: All right. So that's matter number 12.

7 The rest of the matters, unless I'm missing them, are
8 the interim fee applications of DLA Piper. And as I said
9 almost a year ago, I wanted the fee applications to be filed
10 every three months. I wanted the fee examiner to have a chance
11 to review them, opine on them, and provide her report. I am
12 not going to rule on any fee applications of DLA Piper until
13 all of the appeals are finally resolved. So I'm just going to
14 keep continuing these. That shouldn't be a surprise. I had
15 mentioned that at an April hearing last year, and that's what
16 I've been doing for all of DLA's fee applications.

17 For the other professionals, their fees are
18 insignificant in the scheme of things when you consider DLA's
19 fee applications.

20 Mr. Bovitz.

21 MR. BOVITZ: Your Honor, the fee examiner might
22 suggest that given the modest amount of other professional fees
23 that perhaps you'd like to move the next fee hearing to May
24 instead of the fairly short run that you'd had. We'd suggest
25 mid-May, but there's nothing magic about that, simply to allow

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

134

1 a little bit bigger buildup of professional fees relative to
2 the fee application expenses.

3 THE COURT: I think that makes sense. We could do
4 this. Either May 17th or June 28th, either one works for the
5 Court.

6 MR. BOVITZ: They're both fine with me. And the fee
7 examiner has her hand up, Your Honor.

8 THE COURT: Prof. Rapoport.

9 PROF. RAPOPORT: Thanks, Your Honor. I have a slight
10 preference for May 17th because I'm not sure when I'm going to
11 have a little bit of eye surgery.

12 THE COURT: Oh, no. Okay.

13 PROF. RAPOPORT: Okay.

14 THE COURT: Then we'll do May 17th. And we'll just
15 continue DLA's. And then, that will be the date for the
16 hearing on all of the other professionals' fee applications as
17 well.

18 I believe those are all the matters on calendar. I'll
19 just go around and see if I missed anything.

20 Mr. Bovitz.

21 MR. BOVITZ: Was it 9 a.m. on the 17th, Your Honor?

22 THE COURT: 9 a.m. on the 17th, Professor, unless
23 you're teaching because I know sometimes Wednesdays are
24 difficult.

25 PROF. RAPOPORT: The good news, Your Honor, is I'm

Zetta Jet USA, Inc., et al.; King v. Jetcraft Corp. et al.

135

1 free that day.

2 THE COURT: Okay. Great. So fee apps will be
3 Wednesday, May 17th at 9.

4 Mr. Lyons, anything further?

5 MR. LYONS: Nothing further, Your Honor.

6 THE COURT: Thank you.

7 Mr. King, anything further?

8 MR. KING: No, Your Honor.

9 THE COURT: Thank you.

10 Prof. Rapoport.

11 PROF. RAPOPORT: Thank you, Your Honor. Nothing
12 further.

13 THE COURT: Thank you.

14 Mr. Bernstein.

15 MR. BERNSTEIN: Nothing for me, Your Honor. Thank
16 you.

17 THE COURT: Thank you.

18 Mr. Torosian.

19 MR. TOROSIAN: Nothing for me, Your Honor. Thank you.

20 THE COURT: Thank you. And there's a number of people
21 still on, but they don't have their videos on, so I assume that
22 means they don't wish to be heard. All right. That concludes
23 the hearings for today. Off the record.

24 MR. TOROSIAN: Thank you, Your Honor.

25 (Whereupon these proceedings were concluded at 2:12 PM)

I N D E X

RULINGS:

PAGE LINE

Trustee's motion for order approving 72 3
settlement agreement is denied
Trustee's seventh motion granted in part, 117 13
denied in part, as noted on the record

C E R T I F I C A T I O N

I, River Wolfe, certify that the foregoing transcript is a true
and accurate record of the proceedings.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "R. Wolfe", is written over a horizontal line.

/s/ RIVER WOLFE, CDLT-265

eScribers

7227 N. 16th Street, Suite #207

Phoenix, AZ 85020

Date: February 20, 2023

February 15, 2023

	126:13;129:19	46:22;57:23,25;59:8;	92:11;93:8;126:23	131:14,20,20
\$	accounts (6)	66:8;73:5;78:8;90:7;	adverse (1)	agreed (4)
\$2.48 (1)	36:12,15;48:20;	93:3,8;117:8;119:2,2,	23:19	17:19;31:22;62:17;
99:6	126:8,9;127:1	2;125:3;127:21;130:1	adversely (2)	68:24
\$225,000 (1)	accrued (2)	addressed (17)	23:3;96:17	agreeing (1)
122:11	122:12;123:16	27:13,14,15,17;	advisers (1)	11:17
	accurate (2)	29:8;39:21;52:24;	91:2	agreement (63)
*	87:2;128:1	60:8,23;63:15;67:21;	AEO (3)	11:23;24:22;28:15;
	achieved (1)	79:7;93:10,12;94:8,	affect (2)	30:21;31:1,3,5,19,23;
	62:20	17;124:24	17:8;49:9	33:8,25;40:14;42:3;
*4 (1)	achieving (1)	addresses (5)	affected (4)	44:7;45:3,10,14,17,
84:25	90:4	9:13;10:23;13:17,	23:3;26:9;55:16;	19:23;46:10;47:2,9;
	acknowledged (2)	19;28:11	59:4	48:20;49:17;50:18;
A	76:21,24	addressing (5)	affidavit (1)	51:15;52:23;53:6;
	acknowledges (5)	53:2;59:23;64:3;	22:17	54:9;55:5,11;56:22;
a2 (1)	45:8,18;52:1;80:24;	110:8,15	affidavits (1)	57:23;58:20;60:19;
83:4	92:18	adequate (1)	83:11	62:16;63:8;68:11,15,
ability (3)	acquiring (1)	13:22	affiliates (2)	19,22;69:5,11;70:4,6;
25:24;90:24;96:18	70:9	adhere (1)	61:14;67:23	72:4,21;77:5,7,17;
able (7)	across (1)	113:25	affirm (1)	80:13,18,23;81:10;
67:5;104:14;105:2;	16:24	adjudication (1)	16:3	85:19;86:5;89:6,16,
121:15;122:25,25;	Act (8)	27:23	affirmed (3)	18;91:6;92:6;97:24
126:24	14:22;15:2;59:1;	administered (1)	13:3;63:6;69:5	agreements (12)
abruptly (1)	64:11;65:22;66:11;	61:15	afforded (2)	17:7,10,14;23:10;
85:25	67:12;109:6	administering (1)	16:11;53:10	47:14;49:14;56:16;
absence (1)	action (20)	57:18	AFP (1)	58:7;62:22;73:3;
35:8	14:19;23:6,13,15;	administrative (5)	98:2	78:21;84:15
absent (1)	25:3;27:20,21;30:10,	38:10;39:5,7;62:24;	afternoon (6)	aimed (1)
55:12	15;50:20;51:1;53:18;	128:12	95:9,22,25;96:4,6;	84:12
absolute (2)	61:21;62:10;70:21;	admissible (1)	111:6	aircraft (4)
24:17;129:9	74:15;75:23;76:7;	106:4	afterward (1)	78:20,22;79:5,14
Absolutely (2)	77:7;88:6	admission (1)	123:1	aircrafts (1)
21:2;129:18	actions (10)	21:25	Again (24)	79:22
abuse (3)	39:13;49:12,14;	admissions (2)	27:15;28:5;29:21;	airlines (1)
85:8;86:19;89:11	61:16,24,25;62:1,13;	21:20;25:16	30:15;31:3,11,23;	120:14
acceptable (1)	68:17;126:23	admit (2)	32:11,12;33:7;35:3;	Alcohol (1)
112:19	actively (1)	25:18,19	40:2;80:1;95:9;104:2;	64:15
accepted (1)	52:20	admits (1)	110:6;113:22;117:9;	allegation (1)
16:25	activities (1)	21:22	119:1,4;125:12,13,23;	78:25
accident (3)	62:14	adopt (1)	127:3	allegations (2)
75:10;88:1,13	Acts (1)	25:12	against (69)	78:14;79:11
accordance (2)	67:10	adopts (2)	12:9;16:10,19,20;	allege (2)
15:17;81:25	actually (15)	27:12;50:7	20:14;21:4;23:8,13;	12:11;74:16
According (10)	20:13,15;23:8,15;	advance (3)	24:11;25:2,2;27:19;	alleged (19)
42:5;44:9;46:5;	24:8;25:9;31:18;	89:23;97:15;106:8	28:4;41:12;42:16,23;	26:24;27:19,20,21;
48:23;52:13;62:21;	32:14;80:7;91:16;	advanced (3)	44:14,20;45:9;47:10,	28:4;30:10,14,15,17;
74:24;83:23;84:14;	96:13;99:22;101:3,	59:10;73:14;107:14	13,15,21;48:8;49:22;	32:9,19,21;47:10;
86:13	10;109:1	advances (2)	53:8,20,24;55:9,13,	51:10;54:24;65:10,
Accordingly (3)	add (4)	58:23;79:8	15,18,19;57:7;58:18;	11;75:6;85:20
25:10;109:6;128:15	29:23,25;104:11;	adversary (61)	60:20;61:16;62:2,13;	allegedly (2)
account (18)	114:2	12:24;14:17;15:8,	63:21;64:17;65:4,14;	24:8;62:4
12:17;15:2;31:16;	added (1)	11,12,13,15,19,21;	67:25;68:13,23,24;	allegedly-multimillion-dollar (1)
36:11,11;38:9;39:4,6;	69:11	16:3,5,6;29:15,22;	70:7,9,14;71:8;72:9,	120:17
51:3;58:22;86:23;	addition (3)	30:6;32:7,23;36:22;	11,20,22;74:4;75:12,	alleges (1)
90:14;91:9;99:25;	50:15;64:10;73:11	39:13;41:12;43:20;	25;79:24;80:5;82:21;	53:6
100:13;126:4,9;	additional (5)	46:7,20;51:12,16,25;	83:17;86:6;88:11;	alleging (2)
128:19	16:4;52:21;93:14;	52:12,21;57:24;58:2,	123:6;124:3,15,15;	53:18;88:8
accounted (1)	115:20;119:20	10,14;59:5,8,21;60:9,	130:23	allocate (1)
87:2	Additionally (1)	12,14;61:4;62:2,10;	ago (1)	22:7
accounting (4)	67:5	63:3,12,14;64:9;	133:9	allocated (3)
39:12;126:20;	address (24)	65:21,23;66:1,8,12;	agree (6)	23:23;127:6;128:14
127:24;128:12	10:16;14:25;21:5;	67:17;69:8,23;70:1,	33:23;47:3;68:12;	allocating (1)
accountings (2)	27:5;34:3;35:19;40:9;	12;71:19,21;76:16;		50:20

February 15, 2023

allocation (14) 18:9;23:11,14;34:6; 14,17,22;37:8,11; 39:4,11;84:7;127:14, 15 allow (2) 71:22;133:25 allowed (6) 26:8;30:4;38:10; 62:23;64:16;85:11 allows (1) 35:22 all-persons (1) 56:8 Allstate (2) 54:3;77:2 almost (4) 15:25;36:3;92:16; 133:9 alone (2) 18:22;72:1 alter (1) 92:4 alternative (1) 38:12 although (15) 21:5;25:6;33:5; 59:16;66:25;67:8; 69:24;74:24;75:19; 77:2;79:20;80:24; 87:4;92:15;105:2 amend (4) 21:6;41:19,21; 85:22 amended (7) 41:15,18,20,23; 47:11;79:7;80:4 amendment (1) 85:23 among (9) 29:24;36:25;40:14; 62:8;63:2;69:7;84:8, 17;88:16 amongst (1) 32:24 amount (30) 18:6;19:7;23:23,24; 26:22,23;44:9;45:10; 47:22,22;48:4,21; 54:24;80:25;81:5,18, 20;82:22,23;83:8,25; 84:6;87:1;88:16; 101:11;103:3;104:23; 118:16;121:24; 133:22 ample (1) 64:6 Amy (1) 85:20 analogous (1) 17:16 analysis (13) 22:2;23:1;24:9;	57:22;59:24;69:20, 23;70:2,12;74:23; 80:17;87:20;88:15 analyze (2) 80:19;125:7 analyzed (1) 80:11 analyzing (1) 57:11 and/or (2) 74:7;111:9 ANGELES (1) 6:1 announced (1) 45:2 answered (1) 76:10 Anwar (2) 66:17;67:6 anymore (1) 103:20 AP (2) 52:20;77:20 APAs (5) 72:13;73:2;78:16, 21;79:13 APA's (2) 47:17;53:20 apologize (1) 99:8 apparent (1) 49:5 appeal (5) 12:9;19:12;26:14; 65:19;130:24 appealed (5) 60:22;63:5;69:2,6; 92:12 appeals (2) 76:10;133:13 appearance (1) 6:16 appearances (1) 6:14 appearing (1) 8:19 appears (2) 77:24;97:20 appellate (1) 76:8 applicability (1) 93:11 applicable (8) 30:1;46:21;53:5; 56:1;73:15;76:20,23; 118:23 application (6) 36:7;76:5;83:6,7; 107:13;134:2 applications (9) 8:20;107:12; 128:17;133:8,9,12,16, 19;134:16	applied (12) 15:18;47:5,15; 53:19;72:10;73:6,7, 10;75:7;80:4,18; 93:15 applies (17) 15:24;16:18;21:3; 26:10;44:10;47:12; 53:7,9;54:5;59:3; 72:4,6,9,17;73:4,12; 80:15 apply (22) 9:18;14:3;15:3,25; 17:1,13;20:8;23:6; 46:18,19,25;47:7; 48:5,13;53:22;54:1; 70:25;74:17,20,22; 80:12;92:6 applying (4) 23:20;51:24;67:2; 75:21 appoint (1) 28:21 appointed (5) 28:6,13;41:7,8;65:3 appraisal (3) 96:15;104:2,5 appreciate (3) 40:11;108:3;129:3 appreciated (1) 95:4 approach (2) 13:15;37:18 appropriate (10) 14:19;26:25;53:10; 93:9;106:10;108:24; 115:7;118:6;128:22; 129:11 appropriately (2) 51:15;53:13 approval (27) 11:11;31:5;33:9; 34:24;38:23;39:18; 42:2;43:7;50:17;59:1; 62:16;63:11;68:10; 70:4;95:11;118:13, 24,25;122:14;123:13, 15,16,20,21,22;124:4, 19 approve (13) 15:22,24;29:11; 38:5;43:13;56:15,18; 63:7,9,18;85:18; 122:16;123:10 approved (17) 13:6;15:7;20:6; 28:21,25;35:10; 54:23;56:9;57:5,6,24; 60:18;63:4;65:18; 69:1;77:5;92:8 approves (1) 52:16 approving (9)	13:15;17:3;40:13; 42:10;44:6;56:16; 58:18;69:17;92:18 approximate (6) 48:21;54:18;81:17; 82:12;86:12;91:12 approximately (4) 63:19;84:16;87:3; 91:3 approximation (3) 25:18;50:13;84:5 apps (1) 135:2 April (3) 109:11,12;133:15 arbitrary (1) 37:12 Archer (1) 55:23 arguably (1) 49:24 argue (11) 45:16;47:4,17,19; 48:4;49:16;70:22; 72:7;81:21;118:17,18 argued (4) 20:10;46:8;74:12; 79:17 argues (16) 43:12;44:4,13;51:7; 52:7,19;54:16;55:3,8, 17;58:13;59:5;72:19; 80:22;82:3;92:9 arguing (8) 10:5,9,20;63:1; 69:2,6;95:14;96:7 argument (26) 13:4;20:14,17; 33:15;36:3;39:21; 40:11;47:12;54:11; 59:10;60:2,64:7;67:3; 70:2;73:14,17;77:19; 79:8;80:17;91:23; 92:5,13;93:24;94:1, 20;126:17 arguments (11) 20:22;27:12;29:8, 10;35:17,21;42:2; 58:21;59:14,18; 130:10 arise (2) 65:11;126:23 arising (7) 53:9,23;62:13;65:9; 72:15;74:4;88:13 Arizona (5) 54:3;76:4;77:3,4,14 arms (1) 112:14 Arnold (4) 7:13;35:4;95:23; 117:22 around (3)	101:25;131:23; 134:19 arrange (1) 57:19 arrived (1) 9:7 Asia (1) 78:5 aspect (1) 32:18 aspects (2) 72:14;89:9 assert (9) 45:25;46:16;48:16; 49:4,11,25;58:3; 72:16;81:12 asserted (6) 31:17;53:24;65:4; 74:6;85:23;88:11 asserting (6) 60:20;70:8;82:4; 83:21;85:10;91:13 assertion (9) 37:7;51:11;53:17; 56:3;67:7;78:9;80:6, 17;91:17 asserts (14) 43:24;44:18;45:3; 51:5;52:16;53:21; 54:12;55:19;56:7; 58:21;66:25;77:16; 82:2,11 assess (1) 25:24 assessing (2) 57:8;83:23 assessment (2) 25:19,20 Asset (6) 7:14;47:14;95:24; 124:3,3,17 assets (16) 35:14;36:18;40:23; 70:8,10;71:6;96:11, 12;118:14;120:6; 124:22;126:1,14; 127:2,24;129:19 assist (1) 14:20 assistance (3) 64:13;114:17,17 associated (1) 62:18 assume (11) 8:16;10:8;104:4,6; 105:23,25;114:7,25; 117:19,21;135:21 assumed (1) 15:3 assuming (4) 24:10;87:1;101:21; 103:1 assumption (5)
--	--	---	---	--

February 15, 2023

49:3;85:6;86:17,19; 89:11 ATT (3) 65:14,16,19 attached (1) 107:12 attachment (2) 61:25;101:2 attack (1) 68:19 attempt (1) 58:9 attempted (1) 29:23 attempts (2) 30:23;46:10 attend (1) 132:17 attendant (1) 45:13 attended (1) 9:12 attending (1) 57:1 attorney (2) 85:21;86:7 attorneys (2) 116:1;117:21 attorneys' (1) 86:2 attorneys'-eyes (4) 111:25;112:10,17; 113:24 attorney's-eyes (2) 106:20,25 attorneys'-eyes-only (1) 112:6 attributable (2) 24:3,5 ATT's (1) 65:24 auction (30) 96:23;97:9;101:22; 102:4;103:19;104:25; 105:19,23,23;106:2,9; 108:16;109:2,7,10,11, 19,25;110:16;111:15; 115:8,10;117:9; 119:5,14,19;123:2; 124:6;125:16,19 auctions (1) 106:2 auction's (1) 105:24 audio (2) 6:9;8:19 Australia (3) 97:13,13;119:11 Australian (6) 97:7,22,25;98:13; 99:2,6 authorities (5) 97:7,22,25;98:13;	102:3 authority (18) 14:19;16:22;45:18; 49:20;52:4;56:5; 59:10,24;60:2;63:7; 64:6;67:4,9;71:20; 73:17;80:11;97:16; 126:8 authorization (3) 14:22;94:8;119:21 authorize (10) 36:16;61:2;101:22; 104:22;105:4;106:6; 122:15,20;123:12; 126:6 authorized (13) 13:15;28:14;36:10; 48:17;54:2;79:24; 94:23,24;104:20; 126:3,15;127:24; 128:15 authorizing (1) 126:7 automatically (1) 55:21 automobile (2) 75:10;88:1 available (5) 65:12;132:8,10,12; 133:1 Aviation (2) 8:14;41:13 avoid (3) 58:5;61:19;94:15 avoidance (1) 60:13 award (1) 62:20 aware (3) 24:25;90:13;91:9 away (3) 109:25;129:6,13 Azlin (11) 8:11,12,12;29:6,7; 33:2,4,25;116:11,12, 12	111:2,8;112:14; 116:24;119:21; 121:20;130:4,6,8,24, 25;131:2,5,16 background (1) 120:4 BAC's (12) 52:7,22;53:17;54:7, 10;55:17,24;56:3; 58:21;59:6,18;82:2 bad (1) 68:24 bad-faith (1) 18:17 bag (1) 19:11 bailiff (1) 97:2 baked (1) 123:18 balance (2) 84:16;123:6 balancing (2) 13:22,25 ballpark (5) 18:14;82:6;85:13; 91:14,16 bank (1) 126:7 Bankruptcy (49) 14:7,17;15:17; 19:21;20:1,6;35:8; 40:19;47:7;49:7,14; 55:1,11;56:6,15,17; 57:17;59:13;60:11, 16,18,23;61:1,3,6,11; 63:3,6,11,17,19;64:4, 24;65:12,13,17,17,20; 66:10,15,16,19,20; 67:11;69:1,7;71:18, 21;76:20 bankruptcy-court (1) 61:9 bar (85) 11:20;12:21,23; 13:3,6,11,13,15,17, 25;14:10,14;15:1,10; 16:15;17:17,19,21; 20:4;22:3,13;23:3,11, 12;24:19;25:13;32:2; 35:19;43:4,5,6;46:23, 25;47:4;48:5,7,7,11; 49:8,10;51:11,13,14, 23;52:1,5,25;53:4,25; 55:4,25;56:1,4,5; 58:18,22,24;59:6; 60:9;61:3,11;62:11; 63:2,8,9,11,23;64:3,6; 65:7,18;66:9;67:1,9; 70:14,16,19,20;71:4, 13,14,15,25;77:6; 83:16 bare (1)	88:22 barred (9) 20:11;29:25;31:14; 43:2;44:20;55:17,21; 70:8;77:15 barring (3) 49:14;63:23;74:11 bars (4) 14:5;15:4;23:12; 49:12 base (2) 79:16;80:1 based (26) 12:13;27:22;44:1, 22;46:23;47:14;48:9, 13;52:9;53:20;54:6; 62:14;65:16;66:2; 67:5,9;71:10;76:15; 77:12;81:25;83:19; 86:18,21;102:22; 126:25;127:25 baseless (1) 92:10 basically (6) 35:20,20;96:25; 100:19;101:6;130:16 basis (15) 37:2;51:23;67:1; 72:1;75:25;83:8,11; 86:11;88:19;89:8; 103:14;108:14;109:8; 112:17;125:14 battle (1) 112:13 bears (1) 88:17 becomes (1) 42:10 began (3) 67:24;68:2;88:15 beginning (4) 100:8,14,15,18 behalf (18) 6:20,25;7:8,13,18, 22;8:1,13;10:5,9; 33:21;50:18;61:18, 20,23;95:23;96:2; 131:13 behind (1) 112:14 belabor (1) 111:12 belatedly (1) 29:23 believes (3) 12:18;25:22;101:19 belong (1) 65:17 below (2) 57:13;102:9 beneficiaries (1) 62:5 benefit (8)	22:23,24;26:9;29:3; 35:10;51:3;102:14; 123:6 benefited (1) 92:1 Bernstein (41) 7:11,12,13;35:2,3, 4;38:19;95:21,22,23; 104:19;111:16,23,24; 112:1,2,24;113:17,23; 114:6;116:9;117:11, 16,17;118:2,4,7; 120:1,2;124:1;125:1, 4,23;127:4,4,14; 129:5;132:23,25; 135:14,15 Bernstein's (3) 34:21;38:21;124:14 besides (2) 13:5;122:2 best (6) 12:18;101:17; 105:19,21,25;129:13 better (5) 13:14;100:7; 104:25;118:3;124:12 beyond (4) 27:14,17;45:17; 77:22 bid (17) 101:23;102:7,7; 103:2;104:5,5,10; 105:25;108:14; 110:18;118:12; 120:18;121:10,22; 122:7;123:13,20 bidder (1) 104:9 bidders (2) 96:25;110:17 bidding (4) 97:3;103:15;104:4; 118:15 big (1) 121:22 bigger (1) 134:1 billed (2) 91:3;128:15 billing (1) 128:19 Bilt (2) 87:20;92:23 bind (5) 16:16;17:14;25:1; 46:10,23 binding (4) 13:12;14:24;66:2; 76:21 bit (7) 33:5;101:13,16; 114:2;131:18;134:1, 11
---	--	--	---	---

February 15, 2023

black-letter (1) 14:1 Black's (1) 70:20 Blake (1) 8:18 blindly (1) 108:10 Blixseth (1) 49:24 block (1) 121:2 blurring (1) 56:7 blush (1) 103:7 boat (24) 97:2;99:25;100:24; 101:18;102:1,2; 103:16;107:10,17,24; 119:21;121:15,15,21, 21;122:2,7,13,13,17, 20,23;124:5,10 boats (2) 99:18;120:4 Bombardier (52) 7:22;10:23;13:4; 15:13,19;16:15,19,22; 17:24;18:2,13,17,25; 19:9,10;20:3,12;21:4, 14,19,25;22:15;23:3, 8,10,16,21,22;24:10, 12,17,20,21,22;25:13; 26:8,14,25;27:12; 29:10;40:20;41:17, 25;45:16;50:16; 91:25;92:2;113:20; 114:6;116:9;118:5; 130:23 Bombardier's (12) 12:20;16:1,25;17:6; 19:13;27:2;32:17; 51:11;91:24;92:9,13; 130:22 Bond (1) 61:22 Bonded (1) 64:14 bonds (2) 61:18,23 bones (1) 88:22 both (25) 12:13;19:22;33:8; 34:10,12;35:24; 36:20,24;37:6,9; 40:11;50:18;52:1; 64:20;72:13;75:16; 77:3;79:20;85:15; 87:21;88:4;89:22; 92:16;112:14;134:6 bought (2) 64:18;79:22	bounds (2) 21:8;51:6 Bovitz (35) 7:24,25,25,25; 95:17,18,18,18;107:7, 8,8;108:3;114:9,11, 11,19,20;115:12,13; 128:7,8,8,9,10;129:3; 131:24,25;132:8,9,10; 133:20,21;134:6,20, 21 Boy (1) 98:6 break (1) 40:8 bribes (1) 79:2 brief (18) 11:9;13:1;14:2; 17:11;26:6,17;35:18, 21,25;36:20;91:23; 93:12,16,22;94:4,7, 13,21 briefed (1) 125:7 briefing (2) 93:7,25 briefly (2) 35:17;38:22 briefs (2) 59:12;94:9 bring (7) 63:18;108:23,23; 109:11,15,16,17 bringing (4) 23:13;25:2;34:18; 68:22 brings (1) 23:5 British (1) 78:5 broad (3) 14:18;47:17;72:13 broader (2) 54:1;113:24 brought (7) 21:4;34:9;46:7; 70:23;71:1;92:15; 125:12 budget (1) 38:25 buffer (3) 101:13,16;104:23 build (1) 101:13 buildup (1) 134:1 bulk (1) 121:18 bunch (2) 121:24;122:21 Burbank (1) 79:21	burden (18) 12:11;16:1;18:13; 21:20;27:1,2;52:14, 15;57:4;80:10,14; 82:4;83:22;85:11; 88:23;91:13;92:20,25 burdensome (1) 43:23 Bureau (1) 64:16 bus (1) 76:2 business (14) 12:1,16;42:9,21; 62:14;78:4,6;119:20; 120:8,12,20,23,25; 124:8 buy (6) 78:21;121:9,10,18, 21;122:7 buying (7) 118:25;120:14,17; 121:4;122:12,13; 123:7 buyout (1) 60:12 bypasses (1) 46:1 bystander (1) 32:20	20,23,24;73:4,7,10, 12,21;74:17,22;75:3, 4,7,21,22,23,25;76:4; 77:18,19,20,22;78:10; 79:9,10,12,17,19,23, 25;80:2,4,8,13,15,18; 81:13;83:23;84:14, 21;87:16,22;92:6; 93:11,14 California's (1) 47:5 CALI's (1) 30:2 Call (9) 6:3,17;19:18;42:4; 45:1;102:1;116:8; 123:18;128:14 called (5) 20:13;43:4;62:6; 84:4;85:21 Calling (1) 95:9 came (2) 85:25;127:7 can (52) 10:15;20:22;21:19; 24:13;25:9,12;27:6; 32:11;35:25;37:17, 23;38:24;52:24; 57:23;58:1,13;67:22; 70:17;80:20;82:5; 87:12,19;90:9;92:22; 94:5;99:9;102:12; 103:9,17;105:3,15; 106:3,4,5;108:5,23; 111:1,2,3,24;114:13; 116:5;119:1;123:8; 124:7;125:3,4; 127:14;129:13; 130:12;131:5;132:8 canvass (1) 57:10 capacity (1) 36:17 car (3) 75:24;87:25;99:14 Care (3) 13:7;67:9;119:7 careful (3) 66:6;89:22;107:4 cares (1) 107:15 Carolina (3) 78:5,7,8 Caroline (1) 7:21 cart (1) 122:17 case (83) 6:14;9:10;12:25; 13:1,9,12,24;14:19, 21,24;15:5;16:12; 20:12;23:20;24:11; 25:10;26:11,14;29:2, 18,23;30:2;40:4;41:4, 11;43:1,9;47:5;51:18, 18,19,20,21;52:8,13; 55:7,23;60:1;62:21; 64:24;65:2,12,13,25; 66:18;70:3;71:6;72:2; 73:16;75:17;76:1,12, 14,18;77:4,12,25; 78:13;79:25;85:18, 24;87:17,17;88:7; 93:24;94:1;95:7; 100:19;101:13; 107:12;110:20;113:1; 118:23;120:5,9; 121:5,8;124:18; 127:21,21;129:11; 130:16;133:2 cases (33) 12:22;13:5,14; 17:11;31:13;36:8,10, 16;41:8;46:12,17,19; 52:10;54:22;60:4,6,8; 61:12,14;66:4,6; 67:20;69:22;73:10, 20,20;76:21;78:13; 88:21;93:14;120:22; 124:2;129:9 cash (5) 35:22,23;95:11; 113:18;120:18 cash- (2) 34:7;36:6 cash-budget (1) 34:8 cash-management (2) 36:5;126:6 Cassidy (1) 79:2 categorically (1) 49:19 categories (1) 71:19 category (1) 21:1 cause (1) 79:4 causes (4) 50:20,25;74:15; 88:6 caution (1) 125:13 CAVIC (20) 8:13;10:17,20;27:6, 14,19,20,21;28:2,4; 40:22;50:7,17;71:6; 90:15;113:21;114:6; 116:11,13;118:5 CAVIC's (4) 27:11,11;28:11; 56:10 ceiling (1) 96:25
--	--	--	--

central (3) 78:24;84:21;87:21 CEO (2) 61:17;130:19 certain (4) 61:18;73:25; 102:12;104:7 Certainly (22) 22:8;28:14;29:1; 33:14;34:7,10;36:15; 39:7,17;59:20;97:19; 100:9,13;102:10; 103:10,17,19;110:7; 111:24;113:16; 126:20;129:8 certificate (1) 53:1 certificates (1) 78:18 cetera (2) 94:2,10 challenged (3) 54:13;82:8;91:18 challenger (1) 52:15 challenging (1) 43:25 chambers (1) 9:11 chance (2) 125:7;133:10 change (1) 8:21 changed (1) 93:16 channel (1) 98:2 Chapter (26) 7:4;31:13;35:22,23; 36:5,6,8,10,16,16,18; 40:14,16;41:6,7;43:1; 46:12,17;61:14,15,15; 64:15;65:3;67:23; 95:10;96:7 charge (1) 121:25 charges (11) 107:17,25,25; 108:4;118:15;122:8, 12,15;123:4,16,22 chart (1) 121:1 charter (3) 120:19,19;121:1 check (1) 131:21 Chen (3) 73:20;76:1,18 Chicago (1) 77:23 chief (1) 75:5 China (1)	76:4 choice (7) 17:6,8;47:3;72:12; 73:1,2;74:21 choice-of-law (4) 47:5,17;74:23; 76:10 choose (1) 108:7 chooses (1) 118:9 chose (3) 16:13;53:13;59:23 Ciatti (22) 6:18,19,19;33:11, 18,20,20;34:1;116:9, 19,20,22;117:1,3; 130:4,6;131:8,11,12, 12;132:21,22 Cigna (6) 68:5,10,23,24;69:9, 15 Cir (3) 56:20;66:18;71:23 circle (4) 130:4,6,8,25 Circuit (47) 12:25;13:10,12; 15:6;43:12;47:7; 49:18,19,24;51:20; 52:8,11;55:1,7,8; 59:11;60:5,6,23;61:6, 13;63:10;64:5,10; 65:25;66:2,5,6,7,10, 16,18;67:6,10,20,21; 69:6,9,12,15,17,22, 25;71:17;76:22; 120:9,22 Circuit's (1) 69:20 citations (1) 73:14 cite (6) 13:9,11;17:11; 26:11,11;85:15 cited (15) 12:22,25;13:1,5,14; 15:5;16:12;67:20; 70:3;73:10;93:13; 103:4,5;124:1,18 cites (14) 16:19,22;17:5,10; 20:13;51:17;61:12; 66:7;67:4;73:17,19; 76:1;77:2,9 citing (8) 44:17;52:12;61:8; 63:13;65:21;86:10, 20;87:16 City (1) 89:3 Civil (11) 11:20;13:20;44:17;	48:5;51:8;56:6;59:2; 77:15;82:14;83:2; 103:6 claim (15) 11:17;20:2;41:11; 42:19;45:12;46:11; 48:7,12;53:23;61:20; 64:17;72:16;74:18; 79:10;87:19 claimant (1) 30:13 claimed (1) 82:17 claims (139) 12:9,9;14:6;16:10, 15,18,20;17:2,19:10; 20:7,11;21:3;22:3,13; 23:3,7,8,11,12;24:6, 19;25:2,13;26:10; 27:14,19,20;28:4; 29:24;31:16;32:2; 34:12;35:9;36:20,24; 37:3,4,6,9;42:22,25; 43:4,5;44:6,20;45:9, 21;46:23,25;47:4,10, 13,15,18,20;48:2,5,6, 8,13;49:8,8,10,12,21; 50:19,25;51:11,13; 52:1;53:3,8,9,10,14, 16,19,23,23,25;55:4, 9,13,15,17,19,20,25; 56:1,3,5;57:7,20; 58:17,19;60:15,20,25; 62:10,23;64:1;65:4, 12,14,17;66:1;67:24; 68:22,24;69:24;71:7; 72:9,10,15,20,22; 73:1;74:3,14,18; 76:13,17;77:14,16; 78:15,16,22,25;80:5; 81:4,6;82:21;83:17; 86:6;88:11,13;92:3; 130:23,24 claims-bar (1) 55:1 clams (1) 35:24 clanging (1) 120:4 clarification (3) 10:20;28:13;117:19 clarify (2) 28:18;54:4 clear (14) 6:12;17:19;22:11; 30:8;31:1,4;32:23; 78:14;106:16;110:8; 114:22;118:23;121:5; 122:3 clearer (1) 25:3 clearly (1) 26:10	CLERK (5) 6:4;9:3,12,14,22 clerkship (4) 9:4,18,20;10:1 client (1) 37:16 clients (3) 34:21;112:12,13 clock (1) 11:2 close (3) 55:10;79:23;107:2 closest (1) 13:2 Coast (1) 40:7 Code (21) 11:20;14:7,21; 15:23;20:6;31:10; 32:5;44:18;48:6;51:8; 56:6,6;59:2;66:16,20; 77:15;82:14;83:2; 103:4,6;124:18 codefendant (1) 44:14 codifies (1) 64:11 coliability (2) 30:19;39:14 collaterally (1) 68:19 colleagues (2) 117:22;133:1 collect (2) 12:16;65:15 collectability (2) 18:11,22 collecting (1) 43:24 collection (6) 12:3,13;19:2,3; 43:15;56:25 collectively (2) 36:22;85:21 collided (1) 88:4 collusion (4) 18:11;45:13;81:9; 84:11 combined (1) 91:4 coming (4) 32:19;105:1; 125:18;130:24 comingle (1) 36:18 comments (4) 36:19;38:21; 111:16;118:10 Commercial (7) 73:19;75:8,15,17, 18;76:14;103:15 commitment (2)	90:4,6 committed (1) 32:25 committees (2) 67:24;68:4 common (1) 72:15 communication (3) 97:22;115:16; 119:14 companies (3) 61:23;120:7,12 Company (15) 8:14;19:1;68:21; 75:9;88:5;120:7,7,10, 19,20,24,24;121:1,1,2 comparable (2) 120:7,11 comparative (22) 44:21,22,23,23; 48:9,13,14,14;54:5,6, 6,7;55:20;71:9,10,10, 11;83:18,19,19,20; 84:2 comparing (2) 24:18;57:7 comparison (1) 99:14 compelling (3) 66:13;67:4;69:21 competent (1) 51:1 competition (1) 79:10 complaint (15) 24:8;32:22;36:22; 41:12,15,16,18,20,23; 46:2;47:11;58:4; 69:10;79:7;80:4 complete (1) 49:24 completely (1) 54:20 complex (1) 63:16 complexity (5) 12:3;43:16,21;44:4; 56:25 compliance (1) 36:14 compliant (1) 33:24 complied (1) 86:9 comply (1) 78:18 complying (1) 46:4 component (1) 24:19 compromise (5) 56:15,16;57:4,9; 61:11
---	---	---	--	--

February 15, 2023

compromised (1) 57:7	111:10;114:1	conspired (1) 85:20	47:19;67:15,20; 76:12,20	59:19;77:23;78:1; 87:6,15;93:19;
compromises (1) 57:17	107:20	Constitutional (1) 63:7	contributed (1) 64:22	111:19;112:21,24,25; 113:10,25;115:2,5;
conceded (1) 65:16	66:20	Constitutionally-required (1) 46:9	contribution (37) 13:25;14:5,14;	116:17;118:5,5; 130:22;132:14
concedes (1) 43:22	25:15;33:12,22	construction (1) 67:18	15:10;20:2,11;31:15;	Count (1) 79:9
conceivable (2) 55:3,4	19:17	consult (2) 112:11,13	43:3;44:17,22;47:18;	counter (2) 84:24;89:2
conceivably (1) 46:18	66:22;80:12	contain (2) 69:22;77:9	48:11,14;49:21;51:9;	counter-affidavits (1) 83:12
concern (8) 38:3;48:15;53:16; 54:8;72:24;128:11; 129:2;131:15	Conflicts (2) 47:8;76:23	contained (4) 63:8;70:11;77:6; 94:4	53:9,18,22;54:5;56:8;	counterclaims (1) 88:8
concerning (2) 44:11;77:18	confronted (5) 61:6;63:17;66:7; 85:18;87:23	contains (1) 96:16	58:19;60:17,20;64:1;	countries (2) 12:17;44:1
concerns (9) 32:18;52:22;59:6; 92:9,13;96:12,13; 102:19;111:25	confusion (1) 116:2	contend (9) 46:21,25;47:25; 49:1,7,19;58:6;59:16, 17	70:15;71:9;72:17;	country (2) 16:24;119:11
conclude (2) 50:24;86:24	conjunction (2) 63:12;115:9	contended (2) 32:25;75:19	74:3,12,15,17;77:13; 82:19;83:1,18;84:16; 88:11	counts (1) 78:25
concluded (4) 69:15;87:16;89:3; 135:25	connection (3) 12:21;15:7;122:12	contends (20) 16:15;17:24;43:18; 44:24;51:13;52:10, 24;53:12;54:19,25; 55:12,20,22;56:5,10; 70:16,17;81:3,4;82:8	control (4) 88:3;94:11;102:6; 109:4	couple (3) 39:20;93:2,6
concludes (3) 45:13;94:25;135:22	consciously (1) 90:1	contested (6) 16:7;84:22;87:17; 88:25;89:7;112:18	controlled (2) 64:20;75:20	course (15) 33:9;37:9,14;114:8; 116:9;118:14;120:8, 15,16,21,22,25;121:6; 122:4;128:21
concluding (2) 31:9;61:2	consent (4) 11:15;33:22;41:2; 42:14	contesting (1) 25:13	convenience (1) 39:5	Court (404) 6:3,4,6,8,9,22;7:1,5, 9,10,15,19,23;8:2,6, 10,15,21,24;10:8,11, 22;11:1,22;12:20; 13:2,12;14:8,10,15, 18,24;15:6;16:17,25, 25;18:18,23;19:4,9, 14,19,21,24;20:15,20, 24;21:2,7,10,16,18; 22:10,11,20;23:1,7; 24:6,25;25:8,8,12,14, 21,22,25;27:3;28:12, 18,20,23,25;29:5,10; 31:20,23;32:16;33:2, 14,18;34:1;35:1,11, 19;36:2;38:4,11,19; 39:19;40:2,13;41:17, 19,21,24,24;43:9,10, 19;44:18;46:17,22; 47:11;48:25;49:1,7; 50:3,4;52:16;53:6,19; 54:17,25;55:12,22; 56:14,15,18;57:11,13, 15,18,22;58:11,13; 59:9,18;60:1,4,16,18, 23;61:1,3,7,9,11,12, 19,25;62:2;63:3,5,10, 13,17,23;64:4,4,9; 65:17,20,23,24;66:2, 4,10,12,14,23;67:3,5; 69:1,3,5,7,13,19,20; 70:18,21;71:2,13,25; 72:8,12;73:13,16,18, 20,21;74:10,19,24; 75:7,20,23;76:1,4,8,9,
conditions (5) 18:9,24;50:1;60:16; 84:10	consequences (1) 94:19	context (11) 13:6,10,13;16:14; 35:11;36:4,58;22; 71:18;79:9;104:11; 126:5	convince (1) 122:19	
conduct (7) 18:12;28:7;50:6; 52:2;79:8;84:12; 87:19	consider (24) 14:15;25:9,14; 33:24;35:19;38:1; 43:13;44:24;56:22; 57:15;59:9;60:2; 73:14,17;84:3;89:9; 93:24;94:1;106:5; 110:1;128:18;130:9, 14;133:18	Continental (6) 64:19,22,24;65:4,6, 15	coobligor (4) 30:17;44:21;83:17, 18	
conducted (2) 28:7;42:6	consideration (5) 19:6;82:24;89:6; 90:18;106:11	contingent (4) 31:4,12,23;65:7	coobligors (4) 30:11,14;32:10; 82:18	
conducting (1) 69:8	considerations (4) 12:2;18:4,5,24	continuance (1) 131:2	cooperate (1) 43:6	
confer (1) 55:11	considered (6) 21:13;32:14;59:15; 60:2;79:15;90:20	continue (5) 9:25;11:16;104:21; 105:17;134:15	copy (3) 52:23;105:14,15	
conference (2) 94:6;129:22	considering (2) 12:8;80:1	continued (1) 126:6	corollary (1) 89:4	
conferences (1) 67:14	consistent (1) 81:17	continues (2) 37:5;93:25	Corp (4) 41:10;42:19;52:8; 78:3	
confidence (1) 43:20	consistently (1) 81:13	continuing (3) 12:4;44:5;133:14	corporate (1) 63:22	
confidential (5) 103:15;112:4,9,15; 114:2	consolidated (7) 34:12;35:13;50:23; 75:4;77:7;78:14; 127:23	contract (3) 23:16,17;30:11	Corporation (5) 64:14;67:23;75:5; 78:4,7	
confidentiality (4) 102:20;110:8;	consolidating (1) 38:12	contractual (4) 23:20;48:15;49:22; 72:14	corporations (1) 78:6	
	consolidation (4) 34:16;39:9;127:18; 129:1	contrary (3) 49:18;80:5,9	correctly (1) 85:16	
		contrast (5)	corrosive (1) 99:18	
			cost (2) 105:17;121:17	
			costly (1) 85:24	
			costs (11) 44:3;62:17;84:17; 101:14;102:8;105:10; 106:13;123:3,5,5,6	
			counsel (19)	

February 15, 2023

10,16,18,19;77:5,13, 21:78;23;79:7,10,15; 80:1,4,6,8,12,14,19, 20;81:23;82:11;83:6, 13,15,23;84:14,20; 85:3,18,24;86:1,3,8, 10,13,14,21;87:8,9, 14,15,19,23;88:7,15, 18,21;89:3,8,11,14; 90:9,22,25;91:10; 92:19,22,24;93:21,23, 23;94:6,8,10,17,22; 95:6,9,20,25;96:4,8, 12,12,19;97:5,8,19, 20;98:4,12,21;99:1,4, 10;100:1,5,14,18,22; 101:8,20,25;102:16, 19;103:10;104:2,15, 16,22;105:21;106:5, 15;107:7,11,22;108:2, 3,7,10,19;109:9,12, 15,16;110:9,16,21; 111:1;112:1,11,20; 113:6,8,14;114:4,10, 16,18,21;115:3,5,11, 17,22,25;116:11,14, 14,15,16,19,23;117:2, 4,7,15,24;118:3,6,9, 10,11,13,24,25;119:4; 120:1,3;121:20,20; 122:13,14,15;123:24; 124:4,23;125:4; 126:3,8,12,12;127:3, 9,20,23;128:2,2,6,7,9, 20;129:1,3,4,16; 130:2;131:4,11,17,20; 132:1,3,5,9,11,16,19, 23;133:2,6;134:3,5,8, 12,14,22;135:2,6,9, 13,17,20 courtroom (1) 6:7 courtrooms (1) 16:24 courts (29) 20:5;43:12;44:24; 46:3,5;47:7,51;7; 53:21;54:22;55:2; 56:9,22;57:9;58:6,24; 64:11;66:15,19;67:8, 11;69:25;74:20,22; 76:22;81:13,15; 83:24;84:3,15 courts' (1) 63:11 Court's (18) 19:11;22:12;26:20; 45:18;49:11,14; 56:17;58:16;63:6; 65:25;67:6;69:17; 71:21;77:10;89:5; 94:14;118:22;129:17 covenant (2)	82:15,23 cover (1) 132:8 covered (2) 27:10;68:8 crash (1) 76:2 created (1) 14:15 creates (1) 14:13 credit (21) 23:11,14,19;24:10, 13,16,20;26:8;79:23; 101:23;103:2;108:13, 14;118:12,15;120:18; 121:9,22;122:7; 123:13,20 credit-bid (1) 105:17 creditor (5) 8:13;68:3;97:2; 120:23,25 creditors (16) 12:5,19;35:15; 37:13,15;38:3,16; 39:4;43:18;44:7,51;4; 57:2,16;62:12;65:8; 107:3 creditors' (1) 67:24 criteria (1) 87:11 critical (5) 37:14;49:3;85:6; 86:16;89:10 cross-border (2) 119:13,24 cry (1) 91:10 cure (1) 42:13 current (7) 25:1;29:11,17; 31:13;43:1;99:25; 101:11 currently (3) 43:9;64:4;101:9 customers (1) 120:13 cut (1) 33:5 D D&O (1) 68:5 DAC (1) 8:14 damage (1) 112:16 damages (7) 21:23;47:23;48:2;	50:9;54:24;86:1,25 date (12) 65:1;97:15,17; 105:8,18,19,23,23; 115:7,9;125:16; 134:15 dates (1) 118:20 day (13) 16:24;40:6;99:7; 109:19;111:6;120:10, 11,12,12,20,24,24; 135:1 days (4) 42:10,13,21;95:2 DC (1) 78:2 de (4) 20:4;39:8;49:17; 74:10 deadline (1) 66:22 deadlines (1) 66:21 deal (3) 111:9;112:6;129:12 dealing (1) 36:8 deals (1) 20:7 dealt (2) 36:9,14 dearth (1) 89:13 debt (2) 30:11;39:14 debtor (13) 20:8;23:15,16; 64:18,21,23;65:1,12, 15;70:3,7;78:13;79:4 debtor-in-possession (2) 36:15;126:4 debtors (14) 35:24;36:1,20,21; 37:3,6;39:15;61:21; 62:5;78:12;126:1,13; 127:25;129:18 debtors' (10) 35:23;62:3,9,12,14; 79:16,17;80:1;126:6, 9 debtor's (3) 49:9;63:21;65:13 deceased (1) 61:21 decide (2) 34:16;105:15 decided (1) 15:5 decides (1) 50:4 decision (8) 19:11;50:1;60:7;	61:5;77:3;102:21,22; 103:13 declaration (16) 19:17;22:17;28:6; 40:18;87:10,13; 88:23;89:15;103:14; 105:9;106:13;109:1, 18;115:8;117:6; 125:15 declarations (6) 19:17,23;84:24; 86:7;87:15;89:2 decrees (1) 64:12 defend (1) 55:15 defendant (11) 23:5,13,14;24:4,5,6, 7;25:2;55:20;76:7,9 defendants (104) 6:21;7:8;9:6;11:10, 14,16;12:10,12,14,15; 16:10,11,19;17:7,10, 18;18:10,25;19:2; 20:3;21:24;22:24,25; 23:24,25;25:1,1; 26:24;28:1,2,16; 30:18,20;31:14,16,22; 33:21;41:1,2;42:3,4,5, 8,12,17,23,24;43:1,4, 6,25;45:5,9,10,20; 48:8;50:10,11;51:9; 52:20;53:8,13,24; 55:9,10,14,18;56:1; 60:14,17,19,22;61:8; 63:24,25;64:2;70:14; 71:9;72:21,22;73:3, 25;74:4,10,12,14,16; 75:1;78:1,2;79:1; 80:5;84:11;87:4; 90:13,13,17,20;91:1, 8,12;92:1;116:16; 131:13 defendants' (14) 18:20;41:20;48:3, 20;49:4;50:14;60:24; 64:7;80:24;81:14,20; 84:13;91:22;92:4 defendant's (7) 79:6;85:5,7;86:18; 87:3;88:22;91:24 deference (2) 12:1;57:3 deficiencies (1) 22:4 defined (1) 43:8 defines (1) 70:20 definitely (3) 29:3;103:12;108:16 definition (2) 15:25;89:4	defunct (2) 120:19;121:1 degradation (1) 100:12 Delaware (4) 19:21;78:1,3,7 delay (6) 12:4;43:16;44:5; 45:12;57:1;81:7 delivery (1) 79:5 demonstrate (5) 37:11;81:16,23; 88:24;102:24 demonstrated (1) 109:23 demonstrating (4) 57:4;80:14;85:12; 92:25 denied (8) 15:20;16:16;41:19, 22;46:5;58:6;72:2; 95:4 deny (8) 29:10;50:3;71:25; 81:15;103:17;108:22, 24;117:12 denying (1) 125:10 Department (3) 98:3,9,13 deposit (1) 64:22 deposited (2) 51:2;126:9 deprive (1) 69:3 deriving (1) 62:14 derogate (1) 71:22 described (3) 14:2;66:2;71:13 describes (1) 71:3 designated (3) 112:4,9,15 designates (1) 71:18 desire (1) 38:1 despite (3) 16:22;30:2;31:19 detail (2) 34:7;105:6 detailed (1) 39:1 details (2) 98:10;114:14 determination (7) 30:5;83:3,6,15; 85:4,8;86:18 determinative (2)
---	---	---	---	--

February 15, 2023

90:21,21 determine (22) 11:23;18:18;21:14, 16,18,23;26:16,18; 43:13;44:25;47:6,8; 54:18;57:13;69:10; 76:20,23;82:12; 86:22;88:20;90:25; 127:15 determined (9) 16:18;23:7;53:7; 61:1;67:11;76:4; 79:11;83:11;87:14 determines (2) 44:19;48:25 Determining (5) 36:23;38:13;56:21; 84:18;86:14 detrimental (2) 97:1;104:13 develop (1) 112:12 developed (1) 81:25 dialog (1) 107:14 dicta (1) 87:9 Dictionary (1) 70:20 Diego (1) 75:6 difference (2) 60:3;70:18 different (13) 14:2,5;16:6;31:6, 25:32;2;39:15;52:3,3, 4;71:4;113:11;127:12 difficult (1) 134:24 difficulties (3) 12:3;43:15;56:24 difficulty (1) 110:13 digest (2) 130:5,18 DIP (4) 36:11,11;39:6; 126:9 direct (5) 17:15;49:12;94:16; 100:25;102:6 directed (1) 77:24 directly (4) 19:25;20:1;67:21; 98:2 director (1) 68:22 directors (4) 67:25;68:2;74:1; 79:20 disagree (1)	67:6 disagreed (1) 74:19 disagrees (2) 70:18;103:16 disbursement (1) 34:21 disbursements (1) 95:12 discern (1) 77:12 discharge (6) 20:7,9;44:14,16; 82:20,25 discharged (1) 74:7 discharging (1) 51:8 disclose (1) 96:24 disclosed (2) 96:17;110:19 disclosing (1) 97:3 disclosure (2) 112:16;115:14 disclosures (1) 87:1 discounted (1) 65:24 discounts (2) 53:17;54:20 discovery (3) 22:16;25:23;50:6 discrepancy (1) 54:23 discretion (6) 56:17;83:13;84:20; 85:8;86:19;89:11 discuss (3) 9:10,10;98:3 discussed (1) 34:6 discussing (1) 109:3 discussion (6) 11:19;69:23;70:12; 107:14,16;121:11 discussions (5) 68:3,4;97:6;98:9,17 dismiss (10) 41:14,15,18,20,22; 42:22;76:25;78:24; 79:6;80:3 dismissal (5) 62:9;63:24;76:8; 82:15,23 dismissed (6) 19:9;24:7;72:10; 75:12;76:6;92:11 disproportionate (5) 18:15;27:23;54:13; 82:9;91:18	dispute (5) 14:20;21:10;40:20; 58:17;77:22 disputed (1) 57:9 disputes (2) 56:3;61:10 distinction (1) 67:4 distinguished (1) 34:23 distinguishing (1) 36:22 distribution (2) 34:14;126:25 distributions (1) 39:11 district (32) 13:2;15:6;19:21; 43:10;51:17,18,19,21; 52:12;54:3;55:23; 59:13;61:12,25;63:5, 10;65:23;66:10;69:5, 17,19;73:20;74:10; 77:2,4;84:21;85:18; 87:16,22,23;88:7; 97:20 district-court (1) 70:4 diversity (1) 76:15 divulge (1) 103:24 DLA (6) 8:5,19;97:13; 107:15;133:8,12 DLA's (3) 133:16,18;134:15 dock (2) 100:4;107:25 docket (9) 71:14;77:1;78:24; 93:18;94:18;105:14; 111:11;126:11,12 doctrine (1) 79:25 documents (4) 29:12;37:2;39:15; 59:15 dollar (1) 38:23 dollars (27) 19:8;24:1,3,13; 38:2,13,14;62:8,18; 64:21,23;65:1,6; 86:25;88:12;91:4; 99:6;100:11;101:9, 10,11;105:4;108:11; 122:6,15;123:18; 130:15 done (4) 37:14;111:5; 126:19;131:15	door (4) 34:19;38:2,15; 127:16 doubt (2) 94:15;113:25 doubts (1) 57:21 down (8) 26:14;36:1;37:17, 23,24;110:16;116:3; 119:15 dozens (1) 113:4 draft (1) 53:2 dramatically (1) 102:9 driving (3) 87:25;88:3,9 dry (1) 100:4 dual (1) 84:17 Dubai (1) 78:3 due (6) 32:12;43:21;46:14; 58:7;59:3;79:23 dues (1) 79:4 DUI (1) 88:8 duplicative (1) 15:12 During (11) 9:9,18,20;64:24; 75:6,14;85:25;94:5, 17;101:4;111:1 Duty (1) 64:19	32:9;38:14;52:2; 82:19;97:1;117:6 effective (1) 30:4 effectively (3) 15:23;18:11;59:2 effectuate (2) 49:8;64:12 effort (1) 29:24 either (16) 11:14;21:23;25:15; 27:20;38:11,16; 42:14;84:23;89:1; 93:7;111:5;114:24; 120:7;121:1;134:4,4 elects (1) 118:12 element (3) 22:1;41:13;127:5 eleven- (1) 63:16 Eleventh (18) 51:20,21;55:7,8; 60:5,22;61:6,13; 63:10;64:5,10;66:2,5, 6,7,10;67:20;69:21 else (7) 6:11;8:17;9:1; 33:14;38:10;94:17; 105:10 email (3) 9:13,13,14 emanated (1) 63:20 emanating (1) 52:4 embedded (1) 46:6 embedding (1) 58:5 emergency (4) 109:8,12;110:11; 126:5 emphasis (1) 54:16 emphasize (1) 29:13 employees (1) 8:19 empowered (1) 61:10 enable (3) 25:24;32:16;89:8 encompass (1) 47:18 encountered (1) 56:24 encourage (1) 18:16 encouraged (1) 43:24 encouragement (1)
			E	
			early (1) 46:17 earned (2) 12:12;26:24 easier (1) 11:5 Eastern (1) 87:16 EBC (1) 64:14 echo (1) 32:17 ECN (1) 41:14 economical (1) 57:19 educated (3) 26:21;54:19;82:13 effect (9) 15:2;20:7;23:19;	

February 15, 2023

84:18 end (5) 71:4;100:8,15; 127:10;129:9 endeavor (1) 101:16 ended (2) 20:16;85:25 Energy (1) 16:12 enforce (2) 43:6;119:11 enforcement (2) 104:17;108:21 enforcing (1) 98:18 engaged (3) 9:9;42:6;73:23 engine (2) 99:16;100:23 engines (1) 101:6 enhance (1) 100:10 enjoin (3) 46:18;48:7;66:1 enjoined (4) 31:14;43:2;55:25; 71:7 enjoining (4) 60:16,19;62:12; 65:8 enough (4) 25:15;36:23;54:11; 107:5 ensure (2) 51:2;84:15 entail (1) 99:12 enter (8) 12:21;14:8,10,23; 54:25;61:3;78:21; 79:4 entered (12) 24:22;30:13;38:11; 41:25;46:17;52:11; 58:24;63:2;69:25; 89:18;124:15;128:1 entering (2) 63:23;65:5 entertain (3) 9:19;106:18;111:16 entire (5) 31:3,12;89:7;94:21; 103:6 entirely (4) 19:10,12;26:25; 37:20 entirety (1) 50:4 entities (21) 7:22;40:15,15,21; 41:13;45:16,25;46:3,	13;47:13,16,25;48:16, 23;49:11,16,23;50:6; 64:20;72:7;81:11 entities' (8) 41:17,22,25;50:8; 54:8;70:9;76:25; 78:24 entitled (7) 22:2,16;23:23; 24:10,15,20;30:12 entity (9) 44:12;53:16;72:24; 77:19;78:10;98:15, 16,18,18 entry (4) 12:23;42:1;64:6; 65:7 envisioning (1) 120:2 equal (3) 42:9;72:17;84:17 equitable (23) 11:24;13:17,18,24; 44:21;47:23;48:2,15; 54:5;56:19,22;57:5,7; 58:16;66:19,23; 67:16;71:9,21;82:7; 83:18;85:13;88:11 equities (3) 13:22;14:1;23:2 equity (1) 64:12 equivalent (1) 56:4 erred (2) 65:20;69:7 Espinoza (1) 87:16 essentially (2) 13:19;103:8 establish (2) 21:15;48:19 established (4) 21:17,19;39:6;53:1 estate (33) 34:6,11;35:12; 37:12,21,23;38:16,17; 49:10,13;50:19,21; 51:4,18;55:3,4,6,15; 63:16,19;64:17;65:6, 17;102:15;107:19; 108:12;112:16; 118:14;120:6;123:7; 125:25;127:2,11 estates (19) 22:8;34:10,23;35:8, 9,14,23;36:18,24; 37:15;38:3,12;50:19, 22,25;63:21;96:18; 126:1;128:20 estate's (1) 51:3 esteemed (1)	19:20 estimate (5) 54:15;82:10;86:24; 91:19,22 et (2) 94:1,9 Euram (2) 62:6,19 evaluate (2) 89:9;91:11 evaluating (1) 86:11 eve (1) 75:11 even (28) 6:7;28:3;36:17; 37:9;46:22;48:4,8,16; 60:1,1,8;72:1;73:15; 80:15;87:1;92:5; 93:12;104:22;106:24; 107:4;110:17,20; 121:8;122:16,21; 123:10;130:9,17 event (6) 9:4,7,9,12,15,22 eventually (2) 62:7;65:5 everybody (5) 39:13;40:5;111:4; 131:23;132:20 everybody's (2) 94:21;126:14 everyday (1) 120:8 everyone (2) 6:8;9:13 evidence (35) 18:11;35:8;36:25; 37:7,10;49:2;51:1; 54:11;77:10,21; 80:16,20;81:8;83:14; 85:6,12,25;86:16; 87:24;89:10,13,19; 90:8,22,25;91:4,16, 21;92:5,7,21;106:4; 122:9,22;123:9 evidentiary (5) 50:5;81:24;86:11; 88:19;89:8 ex (1) 106:18 exact (1) 29:20 exacting (2) 52:14;92:19 exactitude (2) 18:19;26:18 exactly (6) 18:20;26:19;36:3; 115:9;119:22;125:15 examine (2) 83:24;86:14 examiner (19)	8:1,9;95:19;107:13; 113:19;114:8,11,12, 14,23;115:14,15; 128:11;132:14,14; 133:2,10,21;134:7 examiner's (2) 128:21;129:2 example (1) 17:9 exceed (1) 49:14 exceeds (8) 11:24;17:17;21:8; 45:5;48:5;49:10; 80:25;81:20 except (1) 132:6 excess (1) 68:7 exchange (3) 62:8;86:5;88:13 excluded (2) 68:22;133:4 exclusive (1) 49:5 exclusively (1) 92:16 excuse (1) 73:8 execute (2) 78:21;124:19 executed (6) 44:19,25;74:9;75:3; 78:16;79:12 executing (4) 74:1;124:3,13,16 exercise (1) 66:19 exercises (1) 124:8 exercising (1) 74:20 exist (2) 23:17;36:17 existence (1) 84:11 exists (1) 59:5 expansive (1) 54:8 expect (3) 112:21;120:24; 121:2 expected (2) 6:8;43:15 expedited (2) 118:21;125:14 expend (1) 108:25 expenditures (1) 39:2 expense (10) 12:4,11;16:4;37:13;	44:4;45:12;57:1;81:7; 107:18,19 expenses (18) 36:13;38:10;43:16; 86:2;104:17,18; 107:11,13,14,24; 108:17,21,22;121:11, 12,14,24;134:2 experienced (1) 87:13 expert (2) 87:10;97:19 explain (1) 21:2 explained (2) 73:9;105:6 explaining (1) 125:15 explains (2) 53:24;81:8 explanation (1) 87:9 Exporthier (1) 64:14 exposure (1) 87:4 expresses (1) 43:20 expressly (3) 13:3;31:4;64:5 extended (1) 66:17 extends (1) 61:9 extension (1) 66:22 extent (6) 32:4;47:21;49:3; 54:1;85:7;86:17 extinguish (2) 48:7;59:6 extinguished (1) 74:6 extra (2) 33:12;123:18 extrapolate (1) 99:7 extremely (1) 99:18 eye (1) 134:11
F				
F2d (2) 56:20;71:23 F3d (1) 66:17 FAA (1) 78:19 FAAC (1) 78:17 FAAC's (1)				

February 15, 2023

78:14 FAC (1) 72:11 face (2) 32:22;72:18 facing (1) 110:16 fact (12) 13:2;20:24;22:12, 13:29;20;30:2,4; 54:17;73:6;78:11; 80:8;127:6 facto (3) 20:4;39:8;49:17 factor (4) 32:18;48:24;54:17; 88:10 factored (1) 92:3 factors (40) 11:22;12:7;14:5; 16:1,2;17:23,25; 21:11;25:17;27:24; 32:12,14;43:13,18; 44:25;45:1,4;52:6; 54:10;80:23;81:12, 15:82;2;84:3,4,23,25; 86:10,14;88:16;89:1, 17,20;90:14,14,23; 91:7,9;92:17;123:17 facts (5) 22:20;57:9;65:9; 77:12;102:22 factually- (1) 17:15 fail (2) 42:12,13 failed (3) 46:8;60:12;69:15 failing (1) 46:6 fails (3) 18:13;49:6;81:16 failure (1) 58:7 fair (7) 11:24;45:10;56:19, 22:57;5,6;81:5 fairly (4) 34:5;38:4;90:17; 133:24 fair-market (2) 102:9,18 faith (64) 16:23;18:3,23; 19:18;20:23,25;21:9, 15,17,19;22:22,23; 25:14,16;27:1;28:8; 30:12;31:10;44:13, 19;45:1;49:1;51:7; 54:12;56:19;68:24; 74:2,9;80:21;81:23; 82:4,6,8,16;83:3,7,10,	16,21,24;84:19,22; 85:8,10;86:15,18,24; 87:24;88:20,22,24,25; 89:5,18,25;90:2,3,6, 21;91:14,17;112:4,8, 15 fall (1) 67:11 falls (4) 57:13;81:21;87:12; 102:13 false (1) 26:4 familiar (1) 87:10 family (2) 61:17;85:22 far (4) 15:18;18:14;82:6; 91:10 fatal (2) 58:11;76:2 fault (8) 44:23;48:4,9,14; 54:7;71:11;83:20; 84:18 favor (3) 43:19;44:6;74:5 avored (1) 57:17 Fazal-Karim (1) 78:2 features (1) 24:7 FEBRUARY (2) 6:1;131:4 Federal (8) 13:20;61:19;71:7; 74:5,20;77:14;86:1; 97:13 fee (33) 8:1,9;95:19;98:5; 99:7,12;107:12,13; 113:19;114:8,11,12, 13;115:14,15;128:11, 16,21;132:13,14; 133:2,8,9,10,12,16,19, 21,23;134:2,6,16, 135:2 fee-application (1) 36:4 feel (1) 133:4 fees (17) 28:25;62:17;86:2; 98:22;101:8;103:1; 104:24;108:18,18; 110:23;118:22,24; 120:14;125:3;133:17, 22;134:1 Feld (5) 68:1,21;69:2,4,6 FEOs (1)	120:15 few (4) 40:10;73:10;93:10; 106:1 fifteen (6) 10:13,14,23;20:16; 68:7;130:15 fifteen-million-dollar (1) 127:5 Fifth (13) 13:12;15:6;52:8,11; 65:25;67:21;69:6,9, 11,15,17,20,25 fifty (2) 62:22;87:8 fighting (1) 112:13 figure (5) 37:17;96:20;97:3; 105:19;111:2 figures (1) 108:20 file (21) 30:16;32:6;43:7; 52:21;103:13,17; 105:8,13,13,13; 106:10;109:1,18; 110:1,19;111:13; 112:5,7;115:7,8; 125:2 filed (46) 21:8;24:25;25:7; 30:6;40:18,20,21,22, 23,24,25;41:2,6,10, 11,16;46:11;60:11, 12;61:14,16,20,24; 62:1,2,11,15;63:20; 64:9,15;65:2,13; 67:23;68:10;69:9; 76:2,25;77:20;78:13; 83:12;94:7;96:10,15; 106:14,22;133:9 filing (4) 58:9;94:9;107:4; 111:11 final (4) 38:11;42:1,10; 128:16 finalize (1) 90:2 finally (12) 20:4;24:24;37:17; 43:7,17;49:16;64:14; 71:17;76:1;91:17; 92:15;133:13 financial (6) 12:14;18:9,24;22:6; 84:10;91:2 financing (1) 78:20 find (10) 25:4;29:20;59:18; 66:4,11,13;67:3;	90:22;98:23;109:24 finding (34) 11:19;15:23;20:24; 21:10;22:13,20; 25:22;47:13;48:10, 19;49:2;51:22;52:17; 54:12,12;55:22;59:2; 67:1;71:3;72:9;74:11; 77:11;80:21;81:24; 86:8;87:24;88:14; 89:12,14,17;90:9; 91:5;92:7,22 findings (3) 31:9;32:17;80:6 finds (5) 60:4;69:20;73:18; 80:14;92:24 fine (10) 10:22,22;98:12; 112:5;113:24;114:24; 115:18;131:25; 132:25;134:6 finger (1) 29:20 Fire (2) 68:6,21 firm (8) 9:5,15,16,20;85:21; 118:1;130:15,19 first (42) 6:18;10:23;11:15; 12:20;13:16;15:16; 18:2;20:5;22:1;27:10; 29:13;36:2;41:15,18, 20,23;42:9,15;47:11; 53:4;57:22;59:12,14; 60:23;66:5,14;70:11; 72:4;73:15,20;75:14; 79:7;80:4;89:14;91:2; 93:24;94:7;97:4; 103:7;113:7;123:16; 130:5 first-day (4) 126:5,16;128:1; 129:15 five (7) 10:16;18:5;27:4; 60:4;84:10;99:14; 100:19 five-million-dollar (1) 119:15 FK (19) 6:20;9:6;33:21; 40:15;41:1,19;42:3; 48:3;78:1,23;79:1,6; 80:5;90:13,17;91:1; 114:7;116:16;131:13 flaw (1) 58:11 flights (1) 79:19 floor (1) 11:7	Florida (5) 13:1;51:17,18,19; 62:1 flouting (1) 94:9 flows (1) 52:18 focus (5) 11:18;17:25;82:2; 92:16;127:12 focused (2) 61:1;121:11 focusing (1) 63:6 following (6) 9:14;42:7;43:13; 72:2;82:19;89:15 foot (2) 99:6,6 footnote (5) 63:10;72:5,6;73:8,8 footnotes (5) 94:4,11,13,16,20 force (1) 72:17 forced (2) 85:24;130:16 Ford (5) 75:9,9,12,18,19 foreign (6) 12:16;44:1,2; 119:11;124:16,21 formed (1) 37:2 former (3) 8:19;63:22;67:25 Formula (1) 79:3 Fornos (14) 7:20,21,21;10:8,10, 14;20:18,19,21; 25:25;26:4;29:8;95:1; 116:8 Fornos' (1) 20:17 forth (8) 22:13,17;29:12; 30:21;107:25;120:15; 121:4,18 forty-one-million-dollar (1) 74:1 forum (1) 71:8 forward (3) 10:3;97:9,16 found (15) 18:8;21:2;24:2; 26:14;45:7;55:8; 72:12;74:8,13;77:13; 80:8;81:2;84:9;87:7; 125:16 four (9) 13:20;57:2;58:23;
---	--	---	---	---

February 15, 2023

59:4;64:25;74:9;76:3; 84:8;127:9 frame (2) 20:22;101:4 frankly (1) 126:24 fraud (6) 18:12;45:14;75:6; 81:8;84:12;85:25 fraudulent (4) 61:19;62:5;85:23; 92:2 fraudulently (1) 85:22 FRBP (22) 42:4;46:1;52:6,13, 17:56;13:57;25:58;3, 20,21,25;59:1;66:17, 21,23;67:15;70:17,22, 23,24,25;71:1 FRBP-specific (1) 46:20 FRCP (8) 52:9;58:15;60:21; 61:2,2;65:22;66:11; 67:13 Fred (1) 88:2 Free (2) 64:19;135:1 freeway (1) 88:2 front (2) 109:7;119:21 FTI (1) 91:3 fudge (1) 123:17 fuel (1) 120:14 full (7) 19:20;23:23;39:14; 65:15;69:8;81:24; 118:16 fully (6) 25:24;38:25;73:5; 90:2;93:21,21 functional (1) 56:4 fund (1) 62:17 Fundamental (4) 13:7;27:18;46:14; 67:8 fundamentally (1) 28:5 funded (1) 64:21 funds (8) 39:3;55:5,15; 108:12,13,15,25; 127:12 further (13)	33:17;50:5;57:8; 70:13;76:14;77:16; 83:17;89:15;130:9; 135:4,5,7,12 future (18) 9:19,21;25:1;31:14; 36:16;37:21;43:1,24; 44:20;55:15,25; 93:25;94:15;118:20; 119:3;121:14;123:4; 128:20 G Gabriel (1) 85:21 game (1) 110:7 gamesmanship (1) 109:20 gaming (1) 110:6 garnishment (1) 62:1 gave (1) 108:13 general (6) 11:17;62:24;67:17, 19;112:10;126:10 generally (2) 67:13;103:5 generate (2) 108:12,16 generating (1) 79:19 Georgia (1) 62:1 Gerstein (4) 67:25;68:8,9,11 gets (1) 109:7 giant (2) 118:25;120:17 Gill (4) 67:25;68:8,9,12 Gillies (4) 68:1,8,9,12 given (8) 44:13,16;82:16,25; 102:23;118:10;130:4; 133:22 gives (3) 14:9,14,18 giving (1) 11:25 Global (1) 78:5 glosses (1) 48:24 Glove (8) 7:14;35:5;40:23; 50:15,24;71:6;95:24; 96:11	Glover (1) 96:12 Glove's (1) 90:16 goes (1) 117:19 Good (92) 6:6,19,22;7:1,3,5,7, 12,15,17,19,21,23,25; 8:2,4,6,8,10,12,15; 10:6;18:3,23;19:18; 20:23,24;21:9,15,17, 19;22:22,23;25:14, 16;27:1;28:8;30:12; 31:10;33:20;36:23; 40:2;44:13,19,25; 48:25;54:12;74:2,9; 81:23;82:4,6,8,16; 83:3,10,16,21,24; 84:19,22;85:8,10; 86:15,18,24;87:24; 88:20,22,24,25;89:5, 18,24;90:1,3,6,20; 91:13,17;95:9,22,25; 96:4,6;112:3,8,15; 118:4;124:7;130:21; 134:25 good- (5) 16:22;51:6;56:18; 80:20;83:6 good-faith (40) 11:19;17:23,25; 22:1;30:5;45:1,4,14; 48:10,18;49:1;52:6, 17;54:10;55:22;71:3; 74:11;77:11;80:23; 81:10,12,24;82:2; 84:4;85:4;86:9;88:14; 89:12,14,17,20;90:9, 18,23;91:5,7,15;92:7, 17,22 goods (1) 106:3 govern (5) 16:21;17:9;53:13, 18;72:21 governed (13) 13:19;14:1;23:9,16, 17;24:22;32:2;52:3,5, 6;69:12;72:25;74:18 governing (5) 17:8;31:5;36:15; 53:5;72:13 governmental (3) 74:22;76:5,19 governs (8) 14:17;16:9,10,20; 17:9;67:13,18;72:20 Grand (1) 89:3 grant (6) 51:8;58:14;68:16; 105:16;108:20;	117:11 granted (6) 41:17,19,21;93:1; 103:2;126:8 granting (7) 41:25;43:8,19; 58:11;66:21;69:7; 125:9 great (4) 56:16;115:4;118:7; 135:2 greater (4) 23:23;47:24;48:3; 82:24 greatest (1) 87:4 Gross (13) 19:16,20;21:12; 22:18;28:6,13,15; 29:1;40:20;42:6; 77:25;130:8,20 grossly (4) 18:14;54:13;82:9; 91:18 Group (1) 64:17 guaranteed (1) 78:19 guess (6) 26:21;54:19;82:13; 101:12;127:16; 131:17 guidelines (1) 36:14 guilty (1) 88:8 H Haberfelde (3) 75:9,13,22 Haberfelde's (2) 75:15,24 hac (1) 7:9 half (2) 19:8;94:12 Hamilton (4) 88:2,5,7,10 hamstring (1) 124:20 hand (2) 130:4;134:7 handle (1) 127:21 handy (2) 99:8;116:4 happen (7) 26:12;97:11;105:1; 109:2,3;119:6;132:7 happening (1) 101:3 happens (2)	19:13;26:13 happy (8) 108:1;111:18,19; 114:23;118:8,18; 132:15,17 hard (2) 90:1;111:4 harm (1) 13:21 Hartog (9) 13:1,5,14;14:9; 51:17;56:9;64:14; 65:3;67:9 hate (1) 109:8 heading (1) 96:23 headquartered (1) 75:1 hear (2) 112:1;128:21 heard (8) 8:17;9:1;29:6; 33:19;130:22;132:20, 24;135:22 hearing (19) 6:8,9;30:12;40:11; 50:5;56:14;74:8; 81:25;83:12,14; 94:18,22,25;119:8,25; 132:14;133:15,23; 134:16 hearings (2) 10:3;135:23 heavily (1) 44:5 held (13) 9:8;12:22;38:8; 53:21;64:5,16;65:23; 66:14,18;75:7;81:13; 94:6;125:18 help (1) 108:1 helpful (1) 40:11 here's (1) 108:11 higher (2) 102:23;124:12 highest (1) 105:25 highlight (7) 46:11;47:9;48:6; 49:13;50:22;72:12; 81:19 highlights (6) 43:23;52:4;54:22; 55:7;72:22;125:25 highly (9) 19:20,22;96:16; 102:13;103:15;112:4, 9,15;130:22 himself (1)
--	---	---	--	---

February 15, 2023

32:25 historically (1) 49:19 history (1) 41:4 hits (1) 31:24 Hold (5) 8:21;116:14; 124:16;128:6;131:20 holding (6) 13:10;19:10;55:14; 65:25;70:7;105:8 holds (1) 12:25 Holland (1) 8:13 Home (1) 63:15 Homes (5) 13:8;51:19;60:7; 61:5;65:21 Honor (172) 6:19,24;7:3,7,12,17, 21;8:4,8,12,18;10:6, 10,19,25;11:8;14:12; 20:14,19,21;21:10; 22:10,15,22;23:9; 24:18,24;25:3,10,23; 26:3;27:9,10,18,24; 28:2,5,6,10;29:4,7,14, 19,22;30:15,23;32:4; 33:6,17,20;34:4,9,24; 35:3,6;36:4;37:20,25; 38:17,22;39:11,13,16, 17;95:22;96:2,21,22, 22,24;97:4,12,16; 98:1,6,9,11,23;99:2,8, 21,23;100:16;101:1, 12,18;102:5,8,10,12, 17;103:9,16,18,22,24, 25;104:8,12,105:7,14, 15;106:8,16,18; 107:8;109:4,5;110:5, 10;111:13,18;112:2; 113:3,16,20;114:3,9, 22;115:13;116:3,22; 117:3,5,14,17;118:1, 9;119:3,9,10,22; 121:8,12,25;122:19, 24;123:10,25,25; 124:10,19,20;126:21; 127:15,17;128:5,11; 129:25;130:3,22; 131:1,1,2,12,25; 132:6,10,12,22;133:5, 21;134:7,9,21,25; 135:5,8,11,15,19,24 Honorable (1) 6:5 Honor's (6) 33:9;38:23;39:18; 103:13;106:10;	124:12 horizontal (1) 120:11 horse (1) 122:17 host (2) 25:5;121:10 hosted (2) 9:5,15 hours (1) 121:3 hundred (1) 24:1 hundreds (1) 16:24 hurting (2) 107:1,3 hurts (1) 107:3 hypothetical (4) 24:1,2;26:12,15 hypothetically (1) 101:23 I idea (3) 16:20;37:17;104:25 identify (2) 6:11;17:1 identifying (1) 50:19 ie (1) 25:16 II (1) 79:1 III (2) 79:1,10 illustrated (2) 23:21;24:17 impact (4) 32:8;55:3,4;96:17 impede (1) 34:24 imperfect (1) 99:13 implicated (1) 76:3 important (9) 14:12;22:1,22; 37:19;48:25;81:14; 84:25;86:14;108:19 importantly (2) 21:16;24:18 impose (2) 23:4;96:25 imposition (1) 60:9 impossible (3) 21:22;26:18;77:12 inapplicable (2) 58:24;70:18 inapposite (3)	17:11;70:11;76:18 inappropriate (1) 93:20 Inc (1) 60:11 in-camera (2) 106:18,19 inclined (1) 38:4 include (4) 12:2;18:6;38:7; 52:25 included (7) 28:3;58:7,22;68:4, 15;73:3;86:25 includes (2) 11:12;66:20 including (13) 12:16;27:24;34:20; 37:16;49:12;60:14; 61:25;62:3;67:14; 69:12;72:16;94:19; 107:24 inclusion (1) 47:3 inconsistent (4) 18:15;82:7;85:13; 91:15 inconvenience (4) 12:4;43:16;44:4; 57:1 incorporated (1) 75:2 incorporates (2) 13:20;50:7 incorrect (1) 18:1 incredibly (1) 115:18 incurred (3) 75:10;86:2;128:23 incurring (3) 44:3;108:17;110:15 indemnification (9) 48:15,16;64:1; 72:18;74:4,11,15,18; 77:14 indemnify (1) 68:24 indemnitor (1) 61:18 indemnity (21) 20:2,10;31:15;43:3; 44:22;49:22;51:10; 53:9,22;54:6;55:13; 58:19;60:20,25; 70:15;71:10;75:18, 20,21;83:19;88:11 independent (1) 49:21 independently (1) 92:2 Indiana (4)	76:3,6,7,8 indicate (3) 83:8;101:8;111:10 indicated (7) 25:6;68:11;74:22; 86:21;87:8;94:23; 115:17 indicates (4) 77:11;78:17;90:12; 97:6 indicating (3) 91:6;96:16;127:23 indirectly (1) 19:25 indiscernible (8) 25:19;28:24;79:2; 86:8;101:24;110:5; 111:20;124:20 individual (1) 117:20 individuals (1) 25:5 inefficient (2) 15:15;17:4 inextricably (1) 55:18 inferred (1) 54:2 influence (1) 88:9 inform (2) 103:12,22 informally (1) 65:4 information (26) 77:10;87:18;96:17; 99:24;100:25;102:11, 13,14;103:12,15,18, 21,24;105:2,12;106:8, 11;108:5;112:3,16; 114:2,13,16;115:21; 116:25;122:1 informed (1) 102:21 inherent (2) 12:10;81:7 initial (2) 59:7;87:1 initiate (1) 69:16 initiated (5) 44:10;53:14;72:23; 75:4;77:17 initiating (1) 58:10 injunction (26) 14:8,25;15:7,9; 21:5;24:24;26:5; 30:24;51:12;52:1,9; 58:9,15;64:8;65:20; 66:9;67:22;68:16,20; 69:3,8,11;70:17,19, 21;71:4	injunctions (10) 13:18,19;46:2,4; 52:6,11;64:12;70:1, 23;71:1 injunctive (10) 13:21;25:3,4;46:1, 5;58:4,6;67:16;69:10, 16 injure (2) 81:9;84:12 injured (1) 88:5 injuries (2) 75:9;88:10 injury (2) 75:23;84:2 inner (1) 9:11 innocent (1) 32:20 input (3) 114:15;115:16,20 insignificant (1) 133:18 insolvent (1) 62:6 installment (3) 11:15;42:16,22 installments (1) 11:11 instead (6) 47:14;51:13;57:12; 69:10;72:9;133:24 instruction (2) 94:14;108:2 insufficient (9) 21:14,16;79:11; 80:20;81:23;87:15; 90:12;92:21;102:22 insulted (1) 130:10 insurance (12) 18:10,25;22:9; 60:16;61:22,22;68:5, 13,21;84:10;121:17; 123:6 insurer (2) 60:18;75:16 insurers (3) 61:23;62:16,19 insurers' (1) 62:23 integral (1) 61:4 intend (4) 10:2;22:7;31:20; 131:6 intensive (1) 73:24 interest (12) 12:5;13:23;37:3,6; 42:15;44:7;46:19; 74:23,25;75:21;76:5,
---	---	---	---	---

February 15, 2023

19 interested (2) 115:17;119:8 interests (6) 12:18;43:17;57:2; 70:7,9;84:13 interim (2) 34:14;133:8 interject (1) 98:8 international (1) 12:15 interpretation (2) 54:2,8 intertwined (1) 55:18 into (28) 12:17;15:1;20:22; 24:23;30:13;36:12; 39:3;51:2;63:19;65:5; 78:21;89:18;90:14; 91:9;92:3;96:23; 98:10;99:7,25; 100:13;101:3,9,16; 102:11,13;113:12; 119:18;126:10 inventory (1) 120:13 investigating (1) 67:24 Investment (2) 62:4;64:17 Investments (4) 7:14,14;13:8;95:24 invite (1) 33:11 invited (1) 9:3 involve (3) 17:2;19:2;76:12 involved (14) 14:25;17:12;43:22; 52:20;55:24;56:25; 63:16;70:13;73:22; 75:5;78:10;88:1; 104:3;113:22 involves (4) 13:25;17:15;19:1; 47:9 involving (5) 45:21;61:8,21;76:2; 93:6 ire (1) 110:15 Ireland (1) 8:14 irrelevant (1) 92:13 irreparable (1) 13:21 Islands (1) 78:6 issue (67)	13:18;14:13;17:12; 21:9;22:12,14,16,21; 23:5,9,10;24:2;27:18; 29:19,20;30:12;31:1; 32:13,24;33:19;35:7; 13,19;36:2;45:19,22; 53:3;56:2;57:22; 59:22,23;63:14;64:3; 66:9;67:9,21;70:15; 71:5;73:5;76:7;77:17; 78:16,22;83:10,22; 84:22;85:11;88:25; 93:21;94:3,22;96:14, 21;98:25;109:18; 110:8;112:20;113:19; 117:8;118:8;123:11; 124:24;125:21;127:3, 4;129:2,12 issued (12) 10:11;46:4;61:18, 23;68:5,6;77:6;97:8, 21;98:15,16;119:10 issues (31) 16:9,23;20:1;25:23, 24;27:5,5;34:2,5,6,15; 36:7,10;43:22;57:10; 59:11;65:19;93:2,6,7, 17;94:8,10;96:11; 103:22;107:21; 111:10;113:12; 118:11;119:19; 122:21 issuing (2) 31:24;65:20 J Jackson (2) 51:19;63:16 January (9) 9:4;40:24;41:1,16; 54:21;76:25;89:21; 90:11;91:7 Jeff (2) 8:4;106:16 Jet (16) 6:14;9:24,24;40:4, 17,17;53:16;72:24; 95:10;117:23;120:19, 20;121:1;128:13,14, 19 Jetcoast (1) 78:7 Jetcraft (50) 6:20;7:8;9:6;23:10; 24:3,11,14;25:11; 26:9;27:20;29:11,22; 30:18;32:7,23;33:8, 21;35:24;36:20;37:2; 40:15;41:1,10,12,22; 42:3,18;48:3;52:20; 76:16;77:20;78:1,3,5, 5;79:1;90:12,17,20;	91:1;92:11;94:18; 113:22;114:7;116:9, 16,20;129:23;131:13; 132:13 Joe (2) 6:24;10:6 John (4) 7:17;75:8;96:2,6 Johnson (1) 66:17 joinder (2) 27:11;41:3 joined (1) 29:9 joint (11) 23:8,17;30:11,14, 17;32:9;47:20;58:19; 74:6,13;83:16 jointly (1) 61:15 joint-venture (1) 62:3 Jon (2) 7:3,7 Jonathan (1) 40:16 Jordan (3) 7:6,7,7 Judge (20) 6:6;19:16,19,20; 21:11;22:18;28:6,13, 15;29:1;40:3,19;42:6; 74:8;77:25;96:6; 110:3;130:8,20;132:4 judgment (24) 11:15;12:1;19:3; 42:1,14;43:25;57:12; 63:25;68:13;75:25; 82:16;97:1,8;119:10, 16,20;124:1,3,9,13, 14,15,16,19 judicial (4) 9:3;101:15;102:7; 119:12 July (2) 11:12;42:11 June (1) 134:4 jurisdiction (18) 19:24,25;49:8,11, 15;54:25;55:2,11; 60:24;61:7,9;63:9; 71:8;74:20;76:13,15, 16;124:17 jurisdictions (2) 76:3;124:21 jury (1) 75:13 Justice (3) 98:3,10,14 K	Katherine (1) 85:19 keep (6) 19:9;95:14;101:17; 106:21;127:24; 133:14 kept (1) 106:9 Kevin (1) 40:19 key (2) 19:6;79:17 kick (2) 37:23,24 kickbacks (1) 79:23 kick-the-can-down-the-road (1) 37:18 kidding (1) 114:14 kill (1) 97:3 kind (5) 14:11;20:1;119:13, 24;128:16 kindly (1) 109:13 King (21) 6:20;7:2,3,3,8;9:6, 13,18;40:16;41:7; 96:5,6,6;98:8,20; 99:2;129:23;132:3,4; 135:7,8 Klein (3) 6:5,6;40:3 knew (1) 59:20 Knight (1) 8:13 known (1) 98:11 knows (7) 29:22;35:6,11; 104:9;111:4;118:11; 121:14 Kristina (1) 8:12 L lack (12) 13:21;25:16;27:1; 52:22;82:4;83:21; 85:10;88:24;91:13; 98:25;99:2,24 laid (1) 126:21 Land (8) 13:7;51:18;61:13, 13,17,18,23;65:21 landing (1) 120:14 lane (2)	107:24,24 language (3) 53:2;66:22;70:24 larger (1) 20:22 largest (1) 12:5 last (4) 41:24;100:8,15; 133:15 late (2) 9:4;94:9 later (3) 9:11;42:11;119:2 latitude (1) 56:16 latter (1) 130:12 law (106) 9:3,5,12,14,15,22; 13:22;14:5;16:8,9,9, 13,16,18,20;17:6,8,9, 9;21:1,3;22:21;23:5, 6,9,20,22;24:9,12,15; 44:10,24;46:23;47:3, 6,8,8,12,15,19,19; 48:1,4,18;49:18;53:5, 7,8,13,17,19,22; 55:21;57:10;60:25; 66:14;70:20;72:4,6,9, 10,13,15,17,20,25; 73:1,2,4,6,7,10,12,15; 74:5,5,14,15,17,19, 21;75:7,19,21;76:6, 20,23,23;77:14; 79:25;80:4,12,13,15, 18;91:20;92:6;93:11, 14;118:1,23;120:5,9; 121:5;125:8;130:15 laws (2) 17:1;44:2 lawsuit (2) 34:9;76:2 lawsuits (1) 63:20 lay (1) 104:12 layers (1) 22:17 LBR (1) 95:11 lead (3) 37:25;77:23;78:1 Leader (15) 7:14;10:17,21; 33:16;34:3;40:22; 50:15,24;71:6;90:16; 95:23;96:10,12; 116:10;125:25 Leader-Gloves' (1) 56:11 Leaders (1) 27:7
---	--	---	--	---

February 15, 2023

leadership (1) 130:19	18:8;26:15;45:7; 74:13;81:2;82:17; 84:9;87:8;92:2	121:11;131:18;134:1, 11	102:5,17,20;103:9,11; 104:8,15;105:7,22; 106:7;108:5,6,9; 109:4,14;110:4,22,24, 25;111:9,21,23;113:3, 10,14,16;115:24; 116:5,6,7,12,15,18; 117:5,20,24,25;118:5, 10,20;119:7,9;123:24, 25;125:1;126:18,20; 127:8,12,13,20;128:5; 129:7,24,25;132:1,2; 135:4,5	market (3) 101:19;103:5; 114:24
leakage (1) 115:21	lien (2) 118:16,16	Local (1) 59:12	Lyons' (3) 31:19;35:17;36:19	marketed (1) 123:2
learned (3) 9:12;109:19;115:9	light (3) 45:11;81:6;86:1	locate (1) 67:5	M	marketing (3) 102:6;103:3;121:17
Leasing (1) 8:14	likelihood (1) 81:4	located (4) 77:25;78:2;79:18, 21		Maroko (3) 113:17;114:8; 116:10
least (10) 18:5;35:19;37:19; 67:10;103:7,18; 106:1,19;118:22; 129:5	likely (3) 57:8;108:15;125:2	location (1) 64:19	magic (1) 133:25 magistrate (1) 74:8 mailing (1) 78:8 main (3) 39:12;110:20;113:1 main-case (1) 106:20 maintain (4) 58:16;119:21; 126:13;129:19 maintained (3) 99:17,19;100:22 maintains (1) 54:9 maintenance (5) 99:15;100:24; 121:17;123:5;126:7 majority (1) 32:25 makes (7) 13:4;20:13;32:23; 55:22;122:24;128:23; 134:3 making (4) 17:19;31:8;71:2; 89:11 management (5) 34:8;35:22;36:7; 67:14;113:18 managing (1) 130:19 mandates (1) 58:4 maneuver (1) 75:11 manner (2) 57:19;109:16 March (5) 109:10,25;131:5, 22;133:3 Marine (1) 99:3	matches (1) 17:20
leave (4) 41:18,21;110:21; 119:3	likewise (2) 46:5;90:11	Long (6) 13:7;14:10;67:8; 94:12;121:14;123:2		math (2) 18:18;99:9
leaves (1) 119:5	limit (1) 70:25	longer (4) 99:22,23;100:2,3		matter (25) 9:24;10:2,4;14:5; 16:6;19:25;25:21; 40:3;43:15;55:2; 56:24;59:7;69:12,13; 70:19;80:19;84:19; 95:9,10;110:12; 112:10,18;117:23; 129:22;133:6
leaving (1) 78:11	limitations (1) 30:1	longhand (1) 11:5		matters (9) 6:13;9:25;40:9; 59:14;93:5;95:6; 111:7;133:7;134:18
led (1) 50:1	limited (11) 32:8;40:23;45:21; 48:17;70:23;94:13, 19;101:14;103:20; 106:19;112:14	long-recognized (1) 64:11		maximize (1) 96:18
left (5) 19:4,10;24:6,16; 84:19	limiting (1) 46:16	look (15) 14:11;16:17;39:10, 20;40:10;98:25; 103:6;109:12;111:18, 19;112:3;113:24; 114:23;119:9;128:10		maximum (1) 44:8
legal (3) 56:13;58:17;122:19	limits (4) 18:10,25;22:9; 84:11	looked (1) 103:4		may (35) 12:21;23:17;34:16; 42:13;54:12;56:15; 57:6;59:16;66:19; 71:20;72:18;82:8; 83:5,10,13;87:11; 91:17;96:17;102:9; 106:21;108:1,11,11; 109:2,3,7;119:4; 123:25;128:15,20; 133:23;134:4,10,14; 135:3
legitimate (1) 38:2	Lindemann (4) 8:18,18,22,23	looking (4) 21:20;37:1;124:6; 127:10		maybe (5) 104:25;105:1; 106:25;114:25;123:8
lengthy (1) 94:4	line (1) 107:2	looks (2) 103:5,7		mean (15) 20:5;37:10;96:19, 22;100:10;104:12; 113:1;119:12,24; 121:7;122:8;124:14; 127:16,17;131:14
Lenhart (7) 85:21,22;86:4,5,6; 87:4,7	lines (4) 21:21;56:7;93:10; 94:13	loosely (1) 36:21		meaning (1) 24:16
Lenhart's (1) 86:23	Linkage's (1) 101:2	LOS (1) 6:1		means (4) 120:10,23;128:22; 135:22
less (6) 18:8;19:1;45:6; 55:16;81:1;84:9	liquidation (1) 34:14	lost (2) 16:4;88:3		meant (2) 70:25;129:17
less-stringent (1) 52:18	list (1) 113:1	lot (9) 27:11,12;34:6; 101:3;119:19;122:1; 130:18;131:14,14		measuring (1) 27:24
leveraged (1) 60:12	listen (1) 104:12	LOU (1) 95:2		mechanically (1) 119:17
Lexon (1) 61:22	listing (1) 39:1	love (2) 104:11;108:2		
liabilities (4) 85:5;126:2;127:25; 129:20	litany (1) 115:1	low (1) 101:17		
liability (54) 18:1,4,19,21;19:13; 21:24;23:24;24:5,11; 26:17,19,23;27:23; 28:1;44:15,16;45:5; 48:21;49:4;50:11,14; 51:9;54:15,17,18; 60:15;68:5;72:18; 80:25;81:14,16,20; 82:3,11,12,20;83:1; 84:2,6;85:1,7;86:12, 13,18,23;87:5;91:1, 11,20,22,24;92:4,10; 126:14	litigated (1) 81:5	lowest (2) 11:25;57:14		
liable (9)	litigating (2) 42:16;45:9	lunchtime (2) 40:7,8		
	litigation (37) 11:16;12:3,4,10; 13:15;31:14,17;43:2, 14,17,24;44:5,10; 45:12,13;51:14; 56:23,25;57:8;61:8, 10,11;62:6,19;63:17, 20;68:2;73:22;74:25; 75:4,5;77:23;81:7; 86:3;89:7;112:12; 114:5	Lyons (107) 7:16,17,17;10:20; 27:4,8,9;28:12,17,18, 19,21,24;29:4,9,19; 33:3,6,15,17;34:2,4; 35:1,6,20;38:20,22; 71:23;96:1,2,2,19,21; 97:12;98:1,6,21,23; 99:5,21;100:3,6,16, 20,25;101:12,21,24;		

February 15, 2023

mechanics (1) 97:14	96:24,24;98:14; 106:1,25;107:4;	months (1) 133:10	movant (1) 52:14	57:1;121:10,19,22, 23
mechanism (5) 51:12;71:25;93:13; 103:7;105:22	113:4;118:21;119:5; 131:17;133:21	Montreal (1) 43:11	move (6) 10:3;111:7;119:14, 15;127:17;133:23	necessary (11) 19:19;31:9;32:16; 36:1;60:9;63:14; 65:24;89:4;90:25; 118:17;126:17
mediated (2) 40:20;77:25	million (20) 11:11;19:8;24:1,3, 13,14,16;27:25;42:9;	more (47) 10:2;15:18;17:5,15, 15;18:5;19:13;21:16; 25:22;26:15;27:18, 25;30:10,14;48:1; 49:6;50:9;52:14; 53:25;54:8;67:15; 69:21;77:11;78:21; 82:17,18;83:3;87:7; 92:1,19;101:11; 102:2,17,18;104:11; 105:6;106:17,24; 108:5,12,15,17,25; 121:8;123:1;126:17; 131:18	moving (6) 16:8;17:23;81:15; 84:24;89:2;129:21	need (31) 11:22;12:16;37:8, 10;52:21;57:9;59:9; 73:13;93:23;99:16, 16,17,19;102:20; 103:19;104:10; 106:23,24;107:10; 108:4;109:15,18,21; 114:5,15;115:19; 123:21;124:18; 130:25;131:18; 132:13
mediation (9) 28:7,7,14;29:3; 42:6;45:15;81:10,22; 130:9	64:25;68:7,8;75:13; 91:3;100:11;130:15	Morimoto (2) 99:19;104:22	much (17) 19:1,13;20:19; 32:20;54:16;67:15; 98:4,21;99:24; 102:11;105:6;107:2; 123:4,4;126:19; 127:5,6	needed (2) 25:22;86:11
mediator (9) 19:16,22;28:22; 29:2;40:25;89:24; 90:8,15;107:15	million-dollar (2) 42:15;68:6	morning (25) 6:6,19,22,24;7:1,3, 5,7,12,15,17,19,21,23, 25;8:2,4,6,8,10,12,15; 10:6;33:20;40:2	Mueller (1) 85:20	needs (17) 10:2;12:7;21:18; 22:20;23:1;25:14; 37:6;38:24;100:24; 107:5;109:23,24; 114:16;124:3;125:12, 17;131:14
mediators' (1) 49:6	mind (1) 19:9	most (10) 12:12;22:1;29:8,9; 41:14;48:25;81:14; 84:25;86:14;88:21	Munford (8) 13:8;51:20;55:7; 56:9;60:6,11,11;61:8	negatively (1) 55:16
mediator's (9) 50:12;54:20,21; 81:22;89:21,22,24; 90:11;91:8	minute (7) 14:4;19:4;20:17; 25:12;26:2;33:3,12	motion (114) 9:23;10:5;12:22; 15:8,16,22,24;16:4,7; 21:7;24:25;29:11; 30:5,16,25;32:7;34:8; 38:25;39:23;40:6,12, 13,16,21,25;41:18,20, 22,25;42:10;43:8,19; 45:17,24,25;46:12,22; 48:18;50:3;51:6,15, 25;56:14;57:24,25; 58:1,6,10,23;59:8,9, 21,23;62:11,15;63:1, 12;65:13;67:3,22; 68:10;69:1,23;70:13, 14;71:18,24;72:1,2,5, 6;73:6,11;76:25;77:3; 78:24;79:6;80:3,10, 22;88:22;92:15,19,21, 25;93:3,8,9;94:2,25; 95:3,11,14;97:6,10; 103:2,17;105:13,16; 106:10;109:12;112:8, 22;124:25;125:2,10, 20,22;126:5,11,16; 128:1,25;129:15	mutual (2) 11:17;28:15	negligence (7) 44:23;48:14;54:7; 71:11;75:24;83:20; 88:6
meet (8) 16:1;18:13;21:20, 25;27:1;32:11; 122:19;123:8	minutes (11) 10:13,14,16,23,25; 11:3,3;19:5;20:16; 27:5;39:25	motions (5) 39:23;41:14,15; 46:6;96:9	mutually (2) 42:25;82:18	negotiated (3) 45:19;75:2;90:5
meeting (2) 14:4;21:12	Mirant (6) 15:5,6;52:12;70:3, 5,11	Motor (2) 75:9;85:1	N	negotiations (6) 47:2;56:19;68:3,4; 73:24;90:8
meets (2) 131:8,9	misapplies (1) 48:24	Motors (1) 86:20	name (3) 8:22;101:2;117:20	negotiator (1) 87:13
Meininger (2) 61:16,20	misplaced (3) 47:6;52:8;82:3		named (1) 64:20	neither (4) 50:1;60:7;69:4; 125:7
members (1) 61:17	missed (1) 134:19		names (2) 116:1,4	new (22) 16:5,6,9,13;17:9; 21:3;23:9,22;24:15; 47:15,19,25;53:17,19; 58:17;59:13;72:10, 16,25;74:19,24;75:1
mention (1) 119:1	misses (1) 126:4		Nancy (4) 8:1,8;95:19;107:8	news (2) 130:21;134:25
mentioned (10) 40:10;60:8;71:12; 73:7,11;89:24;94:2, 11;121:9;133:15	missing (1) 133:7		narrow (1) 70:24	next (10) 16:8;42:24,25;61:1; 105:18;125:19; 129:22;130:1;131:18; 133:23
mentioning (1) 118:19	misunderstanding (3) 129:15,16,17		narrowed (1) 49:24	nexus (2) 55:8;79:12
merely (3) 77:11;98:13,18	modest (1) 133:22		National (2) 68:6,21	nice (1) 115:18
merit (1) 56:12	modification (1) 33:23		nature (7) 12:15;29:17;49:3; 85:7;86:17;114:4; 121:23	night (1) 120:3
merits (2) 46:22;50:4	modified (6) 54:4;59:6;71:13,14, 16;93:18		Navarro (7) 84:20,25;87:21,22, 25;88:4,12	
met (7) 16:2;80:14;82:5; 89:20;90:23;92:17,25	modify (2) 26:7;41:2		Navarro's (1) 88:10	
method (1) 87:17	moment (1) 117:11		navigate (1) 44:2	
Meyers (2) 75:8,14	money (4) 34:18;36:10;38:24; 55:16		near (1) 46:3	
Michael (6) 6:19;7:13;33:20; 35:4;95:22;131:12	moneys (1) 126:21		necessarily (5)	
Middle (3) 51:18,19;120:3	money's (1) 127:16			
mid-May (1) 133:25	month (2) 106:1;108:18			
might (15) 17:1,2;37:4;38:1;	monthly (5) 98:4;99:7,11; 104:24;121:25			

February 15, 2023

nightmare (1) 128:16	note (5) 14:12;46:3;47:11; 48:10;50:15	104:16,19	6:7;67:24	79:18;101:5
nine (4) 19:8;24:2,11,14	noted (17) 18:24;57:17;61:9; 63:13;64:9;69:9; 73:13;75:20;78:23; 80:8;85:3;86:10; 88:18;92:21;93:4,23; 99:3	objecting (3) 8:13;12:24;13:9	often (1) 57:19	operating (4) 36:11,13;120:20; 121:3
ninety- (1) 24:10		objection (12) 12:20;27:22;35:7; 36:4;40:23;52:24; 63:4;69:2;96:10; 104:16,19;113:18	Ohio (1) 55:23	operation (3) 75:5;79:16;80:2
ninety-five (1) 126:22		objections (3) 38:5;50:16;57:16	older (1) 102:2	operational (1) 36:9
ninety-nine (2) 24:4,16	notes (3) 50:8;51:22;71:13	objective (1) 23:1	once (6) 22:12;97:16; 103:24;110:11; 121:18,20	operations (1) 120:9
ninety-one (1) 24:13	notice (27) 25:5;41:2;46:9,12, 13,16,20;52:22;53:1, 4;56:14;59:6;83:5,12; 94:21;109:17,17,22, 24;110:1,2,11,11,12; 118:21;125:1,18	objectives (4) 18:15;82:7;84:17; 85:13	one (67) 8:16;10:19;11:11; 15:14,16,16;18:24; 22:21;23:12;24:16; 25:10;28:12;29:13; 30:14,25;32:1,1; 35:12,16,21,23;36:12, 12;37:12;44:14; 48:25;56:22;58:24; 60:6,7;61:12;65:19; 68:9;71:5;73:21; 74:25;79:3;81:14; 82:17,18;83:3;84:25; 86:13;90:4;91:24; 92:19;94:10;98:7,8; 101:20;107:10; 109:15;113:18;114:2; 116:24;117:11,19; 125:21,25;126:4,10, 10;127:11;130:4; 131:20;133:1;134:4	opine (2) 125:6;133:11
Ninth (16) 12:25;13:9;43:12; 47:7;49:18,19,24; 55:1;59:11;66:16,18; 67:6,10;71:17;76:21; 120:9	notices (1) 93:21	obligated (1) 79:13		opined (2) 87:9;92:19
Nobody (1) 104:15	noting (1) 74:19	obligation (1) 24:21		opines (1) 90:15
nodding (1) 116:21	notwithstanding (2) 22:5;38:5	obligee (1) 37:22		opinion (2) 107:21;108:1
nominal (2) 19:7;26:22	November (8) 40:19;49:5;50:12; 54:20;81:22;89:21, 24;94:5	obligors (1) 83:4		opponent (1) 93:20
nonappealable (1) 42:11	novo (1) 74:10	obtain (7) 14:12;42:14;58:9; 67:16;71:20;101:1; 102:2		opportunity (4) 39:10;59:25;125:5; 132:20
nonbankruptcy (1) 47:5	Nowhere (1) 126:11	obtained (3) 58:1;59:21;97:23		opposed (1) 19:14
nondebtor (2) 49:9;61:8	Nucorp (8) 16:12;17:14;47:4; 73:11,19,22,23;76:12	obtaining (2) 102:3;123:13	one- (1) 42:14	opposite (1) 127:10
nondebtors (2) 49:22,23	Nucorp's (1) 73:25	obviously (8) 96:10,23;101:16; 111:18;112:11; 114:23;115:7;124:24	ongoing (3) 12:11;97:12;98:17	opposition (13) 28:11;40:21,22; 50:8;56:10,11;58:3; 59:18;72:7;76:24; 90:16;92:16;125:23
None (2) 12:24;17:12	NUFIC (4) 68:21;69:2,4,6	occurred (4) 46:15;75:25;77:21; 80:7	only (59) 8:20;9:9;11:23; 13:11;14:14,24;16:3; 17:13,25;19:11;24:5, 9,13,16;26:13,20; 32:4;45:21;46:12; 48:13,15;50:11;51:3; 52:25;54:5,13;56:1; 57:10;59:17;63:2; 66:19;70:25;71:20; 72:25;78:10;82:5,8; 86:24;89:19;90:3; 91:18;93:11;106:20, 25;111:23,25;112:10, 17,23;113:21,23,24; 118:8,15,24;121:22; 122:5,11;123:14	oral (1) 41:5
nonissue (1) 119:4	number (24) 10:4;12:22;28:3; 40:3;42:19;44:24; 66:5;77:1;82:17;93:7; 94:8,18;95:10,13; 96:24;97:5;102:17, 18;104:9;105:11; 123:17,19;133:6; 135:20	occurrences (1) 65:10		order (95) 6:3,4,15;10:11; 11:20;12:21,23;13:3, 3;14:6,15,23;15:10, 10,12;17:17,19,21; 20:4;27:16;29:17; 30:24;31:2,6,8,11,21, 24;32:1;33:7,23; 35:22;36:6,7,9;37:21; 38:7,11;40:13;41:2, 25;42:10;43:7,8; 46:16;51:23;52:25; 53:4;54:2,4;55:1,25; 56:9;58:18,22;59:6; 60:10;62:11;63:2,8,9, 23;64:3,6;65:7,18; 66:9;67:1,9;69:17; 70:16,19,21;71:4,13, 14,15,25;74:11;77:6, 8,9,13;83:7;93:17,18; 95:2;96:14;113:18; 123:21;126:12,15; 127:25;128:3;129:17
nonparties (3) 16:16;17:14;46:24	numerous (5) 41:5,12;53:21; 60:13;94:14	occurring (1) 79:9		ordered (1) 94:12
nonpayroll (1) 36:13	Nyota (1) 79:24	off (9) 9:24,25;33:5;39:24; 95:7,15;104:22; 124:16;135:23		ordering (1) 31:12
nonreport (1) 131:17	O	offer (2) 35:18;115:18		orders (6) 13:6;61:3,3;63:11;
nonsettling (22) 22:24;23:4,13;43:5; 47:21;55:9;56:1;59:4; 60:17,19,22,24;63:24; 64:2,7;70:14;74:9,12, 16,25;81:9;84:12	object (5) 34:21;38:24; 112:21;126:24; 127:14	offered (2) 60:14;75:14	oOo- (1) 6:2	
nonsettlor (2) 23:15;88:24	objected (5) 62:25;64:2;65:14;	offers (2) 9:20;75:16	open (2) 15:15,21	
nor (5) 9:10;30:18;56:6; 69:4;104:16		office (1) 113:17	opening (1) 16:5	
Norma (1) 87:25		officer (1) 102:7	operate (1) 49:17	
normal (1) 120:25		officers (1) 73:25	operated (5) 64:18,19;78:17;	
normally (1) 96:9		official (2)		
North (3) 78:4,7,8				
Northern (2) 52:12;55:23				

February 15, 2023

94:16;96:23 ordinary (9) 51:6;118:14;120:8; 15,16,21,22;121:6; 122:4 ordinary-course (3) 36:9,13;120:6 Oregon (1) 75:19 original (4) 31:2;76:16;84:24; 89:2 others (6) 37:13;68:1;82:22; 111:16;126:10; 127:14 otherwise (8) 12:25;13:10;26:11; 37:12;68:18;74:7; 107:20;128:15 ought (1) 30:7 ours (1) 16:2 ourselves (1) 98:10 out (31) 14:6;18:14;41:4; 53:23;65:9,11;68:13; 78:11;82:6;85:12; 91:14;94:11;99:14; 21:100:12;104:13; 105:19;107:23; 109:24;113:20;116:1; 117:20;118:14; 120:11,12,24;121:15; 122:3;124:7;125:16; 126:21 outcome (1) 58:17 outlining (1) 106:13 out-of- (1) 121:22 out-of-the-ordinary-course (1) 122:16 outside (1) 65:20 over (15) 16:13;33:4;48:24; 55:2;60:24;61:7; 67:18;69:2;76:13,16; 99:16;100:10,23; 104:10;105:17 overall (1) 12:13 overbroad (2) 30:22;45:22 overpriced (1) 79:5 overreaching (2) 45:22;48:12 override (1)	66:15 overruled (2) 56:11;63:3 oversized (1) 94:7 overturned (1) 19:12 overview (1) 11:9 owed (4) 65:1,15;101:9; 130:15 owes (1) 23:15 own (8) 36:20,24;37:9; 78:13;104:4;122:2; 123:1,23 owned (3) 35:24;37:6;64:20 owns (5) 35:9;36:24;38:13; 50:19,25 P page (7) 14:3;17:11;21:21; 26:6;94:12;126:15; 128:3 pages (1) 13:6 paid (10) 18:7;23:25;48:4; 68:13;79:2;81:18; 82:24;84:6;88:17; 91:3 paper (1) 27:12 papers (3) 10:16;84:24;89:2 paragraph (1) 27:25 paramount (3) 43:17;44:7;57:2 parent (1) 63:22 parked (1) 88:2 part (17) 15:9,10;30:9;41:19; 19,21,22;42:18,20; 51:14;58:19;67:10; 70:13;78:18;96:21; 102:5;114:15 parte (1) 106:19 partial (5) 44:22;54:6;71:10; 75:18;83:19 partially-terminated (1) 75:3 participant (1)	97:1 participate (3) 47:2;132:25;133:3 participated (2) 9:17;90:7 participating (1) 9:22 particular (6) 9:5,16;38:17;90:5; 93:3;112:18 particularly (2) 64:3;120:19 parties (60) 12:24;13:9;15:18; 17:3,7;21:13;25:1; 28:14;29:18;30:10; 31:13;32:6,9,14,24, 24;34:20;39:10; 42:25;44:17;45:21; 46:9,14;47:1;49:9,20; 52:22,25;59:4;61:10; 62:7,13;65:8;68:17, 17;69:4;70:5,6;81:9; 83:5,8;84:17;88:19; 90:1,5,7;94:5,9; 97:23;106:21,21; 110:20;111:20; 113:21;115:1,2,5; 116:1;130:17,20 parties' (11) 16:21;19:18;28:8; 32:13;54:15;81:16; 82:11;85:1;90:3; 91:20;130:10 partner (1) 130:19 partners (2) 62:3,4 parts (1) 23:12 party (33) 20:5;23:14;29:14, 15,21;30:2,9;38:23; 43:5;44:15,16;49:18; 53:3;63:1;70:9;71:5; 81:16;82:4,20,25; 83:1,5,11,21;85:10; 91:13;94:1,15;95:1; 104:20;107:10; 116:24;131:9 party-in- (1) 46:18 party's (1) 22:6 pass (1) 114:12 passing (1) 73:7 past (2) 35:11;123:16 patently (1) 30:21 pattern (1)	13:2 pay (14) 11:10;18:7;42:8; 45:6;65:6;79:14;81:1; 84:8;86:5;104:22; 108:17;122:8;123:16; 125:2 payables (1) 126:10 paying (8) 24:3;118:24; 120:14,15;121:3; 122:5,11;123:22 payment (4) 11:14;28:25;42:13; 75:19 payments (3) 22:8;24:9;42:9 payroll (2) 36:12;126:10 peel (1) 22:16 penalty (3) 42:15;109:19; 125:15 pendent (3) 74:14,20;76:13 pending (6) 7:9;21:7;30:25; 42:23;43:10;58:17 penny (1) 104:10 people (6) 6:15;95:13;104:5; 113:4;126:24;135:20 per (3) 87:8;99:6,6 percent (4) 24:4,16;87:3; 126:22 percentage (1) 24:11 Perfect (1) 8:25 perhaps (4) 12:12;100:6; 101:14;133:23 period (1) 100:9 peripheral (1) 124:24 perjury (2) 109:19;125:15 permanent (2) 64:8;68:16 permanently (2) 60:19;62:11 permits (1) 14:7 permitted (1) 117:21 permitting (1) 18:17	person (8) 6:18;48:8;54:14; 55:25;74:5;82:10; 91:19,22 personal (1) 75:23 personnel (1) 79:18 persons (2) 64:20;70:8 persuasive (7) 17:15;59:19;60:5; 66:5;69:21;77:4; 125:19 pertinent (1) 87:11 petition (1) 65:1 petitions (1) 41:6 phonetic (1) 99:20 pick (1) 111:5 pieces (1) 10:21 Pillsbury (1) 7:22 pilots (1) 121:3 Piper (4) 8:5,19;133:8,12 place (5) 78:4,6;87:18; 117:10;119:6 places (2) 54:16;94:14 plain (2) 66:22;70:23 plaintiff (2) 30:13;76:6 plaintiffs (3) 73:23,24;84:8 plaintiffs' (1) 25:18 plaintiff's (4) 47:20;81:17;84:2,5 plan (1) 34:14 Plane (1) 79:12 planes (1) 78:17 planning (1) 129:10 play (1) 107:18 Please (9) 6:4,11,16;34:3; 95:2;114:16;115:17, 22;116:1 pleasure (1) 21:12
---	---	--	---	---

February 15, 2023

pled (1) 88:8	71:21	prevent (2) 68:20;70:20	129:24;130:16,17; 131:6	13:21
plenty (1) 129:21	practical (2) 16:5;57:19	preventing (2) 68:16;70:21	proceeded (1) 75:12	proof (9) 18:2;21:20;41:10; 42:19;52:15;82:4; 83:22;85:11;92:20
plus (1) 42:15	precedent (2) 66:3;76:22	prevents (1) 119:19	proceeding (52) 12:24;14:18;15:8, 11,12,13,15,19,21; 16:3,5,6;29:15,22; 30:6;32:8,9,10;43:20; 46:7,20;51:13,16,25; 52:12,21;58:2,10,15; 59:5,8,22;60:9,12,15; 61:4;62:2;63:3,13,14; 65:21,23;66:1,8; 67:16,17;69:8;70:12; 71:21;76:17;92:12; 93:9	proofs (2) 11:17;46:11
pm (3) 95:8,8;135:25	precision (3) 18:19;54:18;82:12	previous (1) 126:22	proceedings (7) 57:18;62:10;66:12; 70:1;71:19,19;135:25	proper (6) 32:7;57:3;64:8; 71:24;93:12;104:11
point (21) 10:19;11:25;15:19; 16:8;20:13;21:23; 22:22;26:18;28:12; 29:13;34:13,16; 37:20;39:22;57:14; 111:12;118:17;120:5; 125:3;126:4;130:18	precludes (1) 58:11	previously (2) 47:11;73:13	proceeds (9) 18:9;34:22;38:8; 50:21;51:2;64:25; 68:13;84:7;126:22	properly (8) 29:15;30:6;55:21; 69:16;86:22;112:4, 15;121:12
points (6) 14:25;20:22;27:11; 28:11;31:24;117:18	precluding (1) 52:2	price (2) 101:18;124:7	process (5) 14:8;46:15;59:3; 97:18;102:6	Properties (2) 56:20;65:9
Police (1) 97:14	prefer (1) 110:14	prices (1) 119:14	productive (1) 131:18	property (6) 49:13;64:18,23,24; 65:16;103:5
policy (9) 18:25;22:9;60:16; 68:5,6,7,8,14;84:10	preference (1) 134:10	primarily (2) 63:6;73:25	Prof (13) 8:7,8;114:21; 115:23;132:5,6; 133:5;134:8,9,13,25; 135:10,11	property's (1) 64:22
Porter (4) 7:13;35:4;95:23; 117:22	prejudice (8) 24:17;41:23;72:11; 82:15;92:11;108:22; 117:12;125:11	primary (3) 68:6;79:16;80:1	professional (4) 62:17;128:13; 133:22;134:1	proportional (6) 25:20;49:4;81:14; 84:1;91:11;92:4
portion (6) 62:20;71:12; 105:17;112:5,7,8	prejudiced (1) 29:16	principal (2) 78:4,6	professionals (3) 107:11;128:18; 133:17	proportionality (2) 32:18;48:24
position (20) 9:18;10:16;16:22, 25;32:19;34:11;37:5; 38:18;39:8;51:16; 55:24;72:8;73:6,12, 18;79:16;81:19; 89:20,23;93:14	prejudices (1) 39:4	principle (1) 88:16	professionals' (1) 134:16	proportionate (20) 17:25;18:4,21; 26:17,19,23;28:1; 48:20;50:11,14; 54:17;82:3;84:6;85:1; 86:12,13,23;88:18; 91:1;92:10
positions (3) 85:17;87:22;112:12	prejudicial (1) 39:17	prior (2) 76:9;123:20	Professor (3) 107:15;133:4; 134:22	proposal (2) 111:9;112:23
posits (1) 72:25	prejudicing (2) 38:16,16	privy (1) 116:24	proffered (1) 21:6	propose (8) 37:8;105:13; 110:22;111:2;113:8, 15,16;127:14
possibility (2) 118:20;130:13	premature (1) 34:23	pro (1) 7:9	profits (2) 12:11;26:24	proposed (16) 11:24;12:7;14:6; 25:9;31:2,21;33:7,23; 41:2;54:4;55:10; 56:21;57:11;83:7; 111:22;126:25
possible (10) 12:6,6;17:1,2,2; 26:16;37:20;44:8; 101:17;103:13	premises (1) 57:3	probability (3) 12:2;43:14;56:23	prohibit (2) 70:20;111:10	proposes (3) 34:13;51:1;53:2
possibly (2) 46:25;94:20	prepared (1) 118:17	probably (3) 40:7;107:5;132:7	prohibited (4) 20:6;31:15;43:2; 56:7	proposing (2) 97:24;113:11
post- (1) 39:10	Pre-petition (2) 64:17;126:7	probate (3) 61:21;62:10;63:21	prohibition (3) 14:11;49:25;55:12	proposition (3) 17:6,13;124:2
potential (8) 12:16;32:1;44:5; 53:18;55:15;72:17; 87:4;115:20	present (7) 37:7,10;50:1;85:11; 91:4;96:7;114:5	problem (4) 18:18;77:8;90:19; 102:20	prohibits (1) 79:25	prosecuted (4) 44:10;53:15;72:23; 77:18
potentially (2) 76:3;104:13	presentation (1) 32:16	problematic (3) 29:20;112:11; 119:25	prominently (1) 24:7	prosecution (1) 62:18
potentially-affected (1) 46:14	presented (5) 80:16;89:19; 113:15;122:22;123:9	problems (1) 74:23	promised (1) 79:3	protection (1) 32:5
power (2) 14:10;64:11	presents (1) 85:4	procedural (14) 14:10,15,22;15:20; 32:3;50:16;51:24; 58:8;67:2;69:14; 71:24;93:12;105:20, 21	prongs (1)	protections (8) 11:13;16:12;37:19; 53:11;54:1;106:22; 107:6;111:14
powers (4) 58:16;66:19,24;	preserve (1) 23:2	procedurally (1) 64:8		provide (20)
	presiding (1) 6:5	Procedure (11) 13:20;31:10;32:6; 44:18;48:6;51:8;56:6; 59:2;77:15;82:14; 83:2		
	Presta (1) 20:13	procedures (5) 10:12;14:20;52:3; 67:13;103:6		
	pre-suit (1) 65:5	proceed (9) 20:18;39:23;89:7; 110:22;111:14;		
	pretend (1) 30:23			
	pre-trial (1) 67:13			
	pretty (2) 119:25;126:19			
	prevailed (2) 63:24;91:25			
	prevailing (1) 95:1			

February 15, 2023

13:14;14:22;44:15; 46:8;50:5;55:5;59:13; 24:82;21:90:8,24; 106:4;111:1,24; 112:23;113:9,18; 115:22;116:20; 133:11 provided (10) 46:12;55:13;60:3; 70:6;74:2;79:3;80:11; 87:18;88:19;108:14 provides (13) 30:9;42:7;44:8; 47:19;50:13;51:23; 24:56;13:67:1,2,15; 82:14;83:4 providing (5) 45:20;46:13;65:5; 116:2,19 Province (1) 43:10 provision (7) 38:7;42:20;68:15, 23;73:1,2;103:4 provisions (5) 25:7,7;47:18;58:25; 72:13 PTE (1) 40:17 public (4) 13:22;106:11,14; 110:19 publicized (1) 106:2 publicly (2) 19:1;96:17 published (1) 51:21 purchase (7) 17:6;24:22;47:14; 118:12,13;122:17,20 purchased (1) 100:10 purported (3) 24:25;30:16;68:20 purportedly (1) 48:11 purpose (4) 34:19;122:5,11; 123:14 purposes (1) 39:7 pursuant (2) 12:23;31:10 pursue (2) 65:14;105:5 pursuing (3) 49:21;62:12;65:8 put (8) 9:2;22:13;26:5; 29:19;33:22;35:22; 36:11;110:2 putting (2)	39:3;122:17 Q quadriplegic (1) 75:11 Quebec (2) 17:9;43:10 quick (1) 117:17 quickly (2) 12:6;109:7 quo (1) 58:16 quoting (1) 89:3 R radar (1) 118:22 raise (1) 125:2 raised (28) 27:6,11;28:11;34:2; 35:7,13;38:6;50:16; 59:12,14,22;63:15; 65:19;93:17,24; 96:11;112:20;113:17; 114:3;121:12;122:4; 123:11;125:22,22; 127:4,4;129:1,5 raising (2) 103:23;114:19 range (6) 11:25;12:8;57:14; 84:1;87:12;101:19 Rapaport (2) 95:19;107:16 Rapoport (15) 8:1,7,8,9;107:9; 114:21;132:5,6; 133:5;134:8,9,13,25; 135:10,11 Rappaport (1) 115:23 rather (14) 20:12;51:24,25; 55:24;57:10;58:10, 17;59:21,22;63:12; 67:2;70:14;98:18; 110:15 re (5) 51:20;55:23;56:19; 71:22;77:2 reach (4) 46:13;50:4;70:25; 113:20 reached (2) 86:4;90:4 reaching (5) 28:9,9;32:15;68:18; 90:14	read (3) 116:1;117:20;119:5 readily (1) 105:2 reading (3) 66:6;67:6;89:22 ready (5) 20:18;40:12;97:17; 110:18;111:14 real (3) 64:18,21;65:16 Realan (3) 62:3,25;63:5 reality (1) 37:11 realize (2) 9:5,15 reallocate (1) 35:25 reallocation (1) 37:21 really (10) 11:18;14:1;16:17; 17:25;39:6;106:22; 113:22,23;121:5; 127:1 real-time (1) 120:3 reason (8) 68:20;72:25;109:6, 23;110:1;115:20; 118:19;121:8 reasonable (17) 11:23;54:14;57:3, 15,21;82:9;83:25; 87:6,12;88:17;91:19, 21;98:25;112:6,18; 128:23;131:16 reasonableness (3) 11:25;12:8;57:14 reasonably (2) 87:18;112:8 reasoning (1) 123:23 reasons (9) 13:16;18:1;29:12, 24;58:23;66:5;72:3; 81:1;95:3 recall (1) 94:5 recalls (1) 101:1 receipts (1) 39:12 receivable (1) 126:9 receive (3) 62:19;83:13;127:11 received (4) 15:21;25:5;79:24; 126:21 receives (1) 42:22	receiving (3) 53:4;55:16;94:7 recent (1) 41:15 recess (11) 36:5;39:22;40:1; 93:4;95:5,6,8;102:25; 110:22;111:1,8 reclassification (1) 62:23 recognition (2) 18:7;84:8 recognize (1) 49:23 recognized (6) 29:9;36:2;45:6; 64:10;81:1;88:21 recognizes (2) 52:22;71:2 recognizing (1) 88:15 recollection (1) 100:7 reconcile (1) 38:1 reconsider (1) 76:9 record (20) 6:12,16;9:3;21:13; 25:8,15;26:5,21;35:4; 39:24;40:3;81:25; 86:22;95:3,7;109:23; 111:19;112:25; 113:10;135:23 recorded (1) 6:10 recover (7) 21:24;48:1;104:14; 124:3,5,17,21 recovery (10) 12:6;25:18;44:8; 48:22;50:13;60:13; 81:17;84:5;86:12; 91:12 redact (1) 106:11 redacted (1) 105:14 reduce (1) 82:21 reduced (2) 47:21;48:2 reducing (1) 52:24 reduction (1) 62:22 redundant (1) 15:14 refer (2) 40:17;87:21 reference (1) 50:7 referenced (1)	96:15 referred (2) 33:25;36:21 refers (2) 13:18;120:9 reflecting (1) 11:20 reflective (1) 37:11 refused (1) 75:16 refutes (1) 51:11 regarding (26) 10:2;33:16;38:21; 49:8;52:22;53:5; 58:21;63:1;68:4; 73:15;75:18;77:10; 78:15;79:8;90:17; 91:23;93:3,7,17;94:9, 16,17;97:7;114:3; 125:24;129:21 regardless (3) 32:13;68:25;130:24 regards (1) 32:18 regular (3) 100:23;110:2,12 regularly (1) 81:15 regulations (1) 78:19 reimbursement (1) 49:22 reiterates (1) 82:1 rejected (5) 13:3;29:24;47:12; 72:8;79:15 rejects (1) 54:10 relate (1) 65:11 related (28) 19:25;20:2;26:22, 23;40:21;41:17; 43:16;45:16,25;46:2; 47:13,16,25;48:16,23; 49:11,16,23;50:6,8; 62:13,18;65:9;72:7, 15;76:24;78:23;81:11 related-to (4) 19:24;49:15;54:25; 55:11 relations (1) 23:21 relationship (3) 72:14;88:17;89:6 relative (4) 21:24;48:3;85:5; 134:1 relayed (1) 97:21
---	--	--	--	--

February 15, 2023

release (12) 11:18;20:5;42:25; 44:13;47:22;49:18; 56:4,8;82:15,22;86:6; 88:13	reply (35) 12:22;13:5;21:21; 26:6;35:18,21;40:24; 41:3;51:5;58:13; 59:10,12,14,17,24; 60:3;69:24;71:15; 72:19;73:9,15,18,19; 77:3;82:1;91:23; 92:16;93:11,16,21,22, 25;94:4,13;126:22	reserve (3) 10:15,18,24 resident (2) 75:22;78:3 resolution (2) 45:20;90:2 resolve (1) 74:23 resolved (1) 133:13 resolves (1) 54:7 resolving (1) 14:20 Resource (2) 13:7;51:18 resources (8) 37:22;39:5;61:13, 14,17,18,24;65:22 respect (13) 21:11;24:24;26:16; 31:16;32:12;36:19; 43:3;107:15,17; 112:3;128:13,22,24 respected (1) 19:22 respectfully (1) 38:6 respective (3) 38:3;85:17;128:20 respond (12) 10:15;11:3;20:17; 26:1;33:3;35:17; 38:20;59:25;81:11; 119:7;123:25;125:4 responding (1) 59:17 responds (1) 126:3 response (7) 10:24;20:21;64:6; 83:13;96:15;119:8; 125:23 responsibility (1) 22:12 responsible (1) 24:12 rest (2) 40:5;133:7 Restatement (3) 47:7;76:22;80:11 restaurant (1) 9:7 restrain (2) 48:7;49:20 rests (1) 56:5 result (4) 45:14;56:18;62:22; 71:5 resulted (1) 81:10 resulting (3)	42:7;64:25;73:24 results (1) 39:8 resume (1) 42:16 retailers (1) 120:13 retain (2) 11:15;42:15 retired (3) 40:19;42:6;77:25 retroactive (1) 66:21 return (1) 62:19 reveal (2) 99:24;103:25 revealing (1) 104:1 reveals (1) 66:7 revenue- (1) 79:18 reversed (1) 69:17 reversing (1) 46:3 review (10) 36:5;74:10;84:15; 106:18,19;107:22,24; 125:8;126:24;133:11 reviewed (1) 107:11 reviews (1) 107:13 revise (1) 25:7 revised (4) 17:19,21;27:16; 31:21 revisions (1) 53:3 rewards (1) 57:8 reworked (1) 54:4 RIG (5) 64:23;65:1,4,6,15 right (46) 11:4;14:14,15; 15:14;16:17;27:4; 28:17;29:5;31:4;34:2, 9,18,24;39:19;40:2,7; 98:1;99:10;100:17; 102:21;105:18; 108:24;109:13; 110:13;111:21; 113:13;115:22,25; 116:12;117:7,8; 118:18;122:21; 123:17,19;124:13,23; 125:5,20;127:8,18; 128:6;129:4;130:15;	133:6;135:22 rights (6) 15:20;34:20;59:3; 68:14;69:3;82:19 risk (6) 12:10,13;18:22; 19:2,3;81:7 risks (1) 45:12 Rivero (2) 64:17,20 Riveros (1) 64:22 road (4) 36:1;37:18,24,24 roadmap (1) 40:5 Robert (1) 61:16 Rock (1) 62:4 role (1) 107:18 Roselius (23) 6:23,24,24;10:6,6, 13,14,16,18,19,24,25; 11:7,8;19:4,6;20:15; 25:6;26:1,3;27:3,10, 13 Roselius' (3) 20:21;22:5;31:19 rough (3) 25:17;50:13;84:5 roughly (2) 81:17;101:10 rounds (1) 41:14 routine (1) 72:14 routinely (1) 51:7 RSVP'd (1) 9:17 Rule (28) 13:4,16,20;14:11, 17;15:1,2,3,17,22; 17:1;31:5;39:22;40:6, 12;46:4;57:9,16;58:8, 23;67:17;69:12,14; 71:18,22;92:15; 126:12;133:12 ruled (3) 53:19;118:18;128:2 rules (5) 32:3;59:13;69:14; 74:21;94:9 ruling (11) 76:10;78:23;79:6,9; 80:3;92:12;93:23; 117:10;129:7;130:5,5 rulings (1) 41:5 run (2)
--	---	--	--	--

February 15, 2023

101:6;133:24	79:3,23	seems (6)	80:7	43:4,6,23,25;44:21;
S	Seabury (1)	70:22;98:12,14,17;	settled (10)	45:4,9,20;48:8,20;
	91:2	122:3;129:9	34:12;44:11;50:20;	49:4;50:11,14;51:9;
Safeguard (1)	Seagrim (1)	segregated (1)	53:15;62:7;72:23;	52:19;53:8,12,24;
61:22	79:20	38:9	75:17;76:6;77:18;	54:15;55:9,13,18,19;
sale (12)	seal (11)	seized (2)	88:12	63:25;65:8;68:17;
15:8;65:16;70:5,13;	103:14,17,19;	100:20;106:3	settlement (199)	70:5;71:9;72:20,22;
71:18;73:23;102:2;	105:13,16;106:9,17,	seizure (6)	11:9,10,12,19,23,	73:3;74:4,13;80:24;
103:6;104:3;119:12;	22;107:4,21;111:13	97:7,20,21,23;	24:12;7,18,21,23;	81:13,16,20;82:10;
121:18;123:3	seawater (1)	98:16,19	13:11;14:4,4,23;15:4,	83:4,8,17;84:1,11;
Sales (1)	99:23	select (1)	7,24;16:23;17:3,8,12,	85:1,7;86:17;88:21,
85:2	sec (1)	28:15	14,23;18:3,7,9,14,16,	25:91;8,11,19,22,24;
salt (2)	131:20	sell (5)	17,20,23;19:7,7;25:9;	92:1,3
99:17;100:24	second (17)	102:1;103:5;	26:22;28:9;29:11;	settlor (5)
salvage (1)	11:14;14:7;21:1;	122:25;123:1,3	30:5,13,21;31:1,3,3,5,	18:7;45:6;81:1,3;
130:7	24:19;35:23;36:19;	selling (4)	9,12,18,22;32:15;	84:8
same (16)	42:11,12,18,22;47:8;	97:2;120:13,14;	33:24;34:19,25;	settlor's (2)
11:21;17:21;20:13;	66:9;67:8;76:22;	121:2	35:10;38:5,7,8;40:14;	84:6;88:18
30:25;36:3;47:10;	80:12;98:7,8	semantics (1)	41:13;42:3,7,18,21;	seven (1)
64:19;71:5;82:18;	Secondly (1)	70:19	43:14;44:6,7,19,25;	95:2
92:19;116:17;120:12;	130:6	senior (1)	45:3,5,6,10,14,17,23;	seventh (1)
123:19;126:15;128:3,	seconds (1)	130:19	46:6,10,24;47:1,9;	95:11
10	33:12	sense (5)	48:19;49:13,17;	seventy-foot (3)
San (1)	secret (2)	122:14;123:12,23;	50:17,21;51:14;	104:3;120:17;121:4
75:6	114:13;115:21	128:23;134:3	52:17,23;53:5,14;	several (5)
Sandra (1)	Section (24)	sensitive (8)	54:9,13,14,24;55:5,	13:16;17:10;18:1;
6:5	11:20;13:11,15;	96:16;99:24;	10;56:15,18,21;57:6,	44:1;61:16
satisfied (5)	14:7,9,13,14,21;	102:13;103:20,25;	11,13,20,23;58:7,20,	shall (9)
17:24;20:23;74:7;	15:23,25;16:12;	105:10,12;114:2	24;60:18;61:4;62:20,	30:11;44:14;82:19,
82:2;90:2	17:18;18:3,16;20:6,	sent (1)	21;63:1,4,7;65:5,7,18;	20,21,25;83:7,16,21
satisfies (6)	11,12;31:4,8,11,25;	9:12	68:3,11,11,16,18,19,	share (9)
45:4;48:11;54:10;	32:1,5;83:4	separate (26)	25;69:1,11,18,18;	18:20;23:24;47:23;
80:23;89:16;91:7	sections (2)	12:24;15:8;16:2;	70:4,5,6;72:4,21;73:3,	48:2,3;84:1;88:18;
satisfy (5)	31:7;66:15	35:7,9,14,14,14;	24;74:1,2,9;75:2,16;	117:21;129:2
25:17;58:8;69:13;	securities (4)	36:12,18;37:15,15;	77:5,6,17,21;78:9;	shares (1)
81:12;111:25	73:22,23;74:5;	38:8;51:16;52:9;	80:13,15,18,22,25;	128:11
saying (12)	77:14	57:24;58:14;61:24;	81:5,10,15,18,20;	sharing (1)
85:16;102:22;	securities-fraud (1)	64:9;78:12;126:1,1,1,	82:5,6,9,10;83:3,5,7,	84:17
107:2;116:24;117:20;	77:7	13;127:24;129:19	9,10,15,24,25;84:7,7,	shift (1)
122:18;125:18;	security (2)	Separately (1)	9,18,19;85:4,12,19;	88:23
126:15;127:22,23;	121:16;123:5	62:15	86:4,8,15,22;87:2,6,	ships (1)
129:8,11	seeing (1)	seriously (1)	12,13;88:17,20;89:6,	99:18
schedule (1)	114:6	88:5	9,16,17;90:4,6,15,18,	short (3)
50:5	seek (11)	served (5)	20;91:6,14,18;92:6;	81:21;107:1;133:24
scheduled (3)	22:16;31:6,8,11;	15:17;19:20;52:23,	127:5;130:7	shortened (7)
109:7,10,11	34:16;71:25;85:24;	25;83:11	settlements (13)	109:16,17,22,24;
scheduling (3)	123:15,16,20;125:14	service (2)	16:21,23;51:7;	110:1,11;125:18
67:14;118:20;	seeking (22)	46:21;53:2	54:23;58:25;63:18,	shortest (1)
131:10	25:4;27:25;30:3;	services (1)	22;64:3;84:16;	44:9
scheme (1)	31:15;43:3;51:22;	28:21	126:23;127:1,1,9	show (9)
133:18	58:15,18;60:13,17;	session (2)	settles (2)	16:2;18:2,13;27:1;
scope (11)	61:19;62:11,15;	6:5;131:19	15:12;47:20	28:1;50:10,25;87:11;
17:17,20;26:5;	66:25;68:10,18;	set (10)	settling (101)	91:14
27:15;29:17;30:19;	70:15,16;86:1,93;13;	11:2;14:6;22:17;	7:8;11:10,13,16;	showed (1)
45:17;48:5;52:25;	104:18;123:13	29:12;30:21;41:4;	12:10,12,14,15;14:18;	82:5
67:12;93:17	seeks (15)	66:21;105:19,23;	15:14;16:10,11;17:7,	showing (4)
Scott (4)	16:16;23:4;32:4;	119:24	10,18;18:10,20,25;	26:25;84:23;89:1;
7:25;95:18;107:8;	42:2;43:9;45:17,25;	setting (1)	19:2;20:3;21:24;22:6,	110:14
114:11	48:10;50:9,17;51:13;	89:7	23;23:14,24,25;24:4,	shows (1)
screen (3)	53:25;71:20;76:13;	settle (11)	5,14;25:2;26:24;28:2;	18:22
6:15;8:22;131:23	80:7	14:19;15:16,16;	29:18;30:18,20;	shrink (1)
sea (2)	seem (1)	25:11,12;51:1;55:14;	31:16,21;32:14,24;	99:22
	113:21	60:14;75:14;76:14;	42:4,5,8,12,16,23,24;	shrink-wrapped (1)

February 15, 2023

100:4 sic (3) 27:15;63:13;83:11 side (4) 68:9;88:2;119:18; 125:7 sides (2) 40:12;87:21 Siegel (1) 66:14 sight-unseen (1) 104:6 sign (2) 68:14;117:5 signed (2) 109:18;125:15 significant (7) 11:13;19:3;14;44:3; 54:23;55:5;99:15 significantly (3) 12:13;26:15;102:23 similar (5) 13:6;16:13;53:23; 79:7;120:12 similarly (2) 45:3;75:8 simple (1) 15:18 simply (8) 15:3,15;21:20; 23:22;24:17;36:6; 69:10;133:25 Singapore (13) 40:18;41:6,11; 50:18;78:12,15; 79:12,13,21,22; 127:11;128:13,24 Singapore's (1) 125:24 single (3) 39:3,6;128:19 sister (1) 85:20 sit (2) 59:23;93:20 sits (2) 74:21;100:4 sitting (3) 99:14;100:2,3 situation (5) 17:16;25:13;26:13; 106:3;110:6 six (4) 14:2;63:20;84:11; 109:25 skip (1) 115:15 slight (1) 134:9 small (1) 9:9 sold (2) 64:25;101:18	sole (1) 88:9 solely (1) 27:5 solution (4) 35:18;110:14; 111:15,22 solved (1) 117:7 somehow (1) 39:8 someone (6) 6:11;8:24;100:22, 23;104:9;115:16 sometime (2) 36:1;119:2 Sometimes (2) 11:4;134:23 sophisticated (2) 59:20;93:19 sort (1) 20:2 sought (17) 29:17,25;30:20,24; 31:2,25;45:24;46:2; 51:15;58:4;67:17,22; 70:4;74:10;88:14; 121:25;122:21 sound (1) 84:19 sounding (1) 72:16 sounds (1) 97:9 sources (1) 52:4 Southern (1) 51:17 Spalding (5) 6:20;7:8;9:6,13,18 speak (6) 6:10,10;11:6; 117:11,25;130:22 special (1) 14:20 specific (7) 14:3;17:5;33:19; 58:22;62:20;67:15,18 specifically (5) 20:23;26:6;32:17; 94:2,10 specified (1) 52:2 specify (1) 73:4 spend (1) 38:23 spent (3) 38:9,24;39:18 Spitzer (2) 8:1;95:18 spoken (1) 6:11	staff (1) 11:2 stand (1) 19:15 standard (8) 52:14,18;56:13; 71:2;92:18,20; 122:19;123:8 standards (1) 14:2 standpoint (1) 128:12 start (4) 10:4;11:22;27:6; 113:12 started (1) 9:2 starting (1) 21:9 state (18) 16:20;17:1;26:6; 58:8;60:25;61:19; 62:1;71:7;74:5,14,15, 21;76:1,18,20;85:24; 86:2;99:25 state-court (1) 61:7 stated (10) 9:14,17;28:8;63:10; 64:5;69:12;71:17; 95:3;105:4;122:5 statement (12) 21:13;26:4;27:24; 40:25;54:21;71:15; 89:22;90:11;91:6,8, 20;128:1 statements (4) 31:20;32:13;89:23; 90:7 states (4) 52:2;64:15;72:5; 89:15 status (6) 12:14;58:16;94:6; 129:22;131:3;132:13 statute (15) 14:16;17:12,20,22; 26:10;27:16;30:1,8; 32:7;33:10;48:12; 52:9;72:15;82:7;94:1 statutes (2) 24:18;77:15 statute's (1) 84:16 statutory (12) 13:10,13,17;14:1; 15:1,3,4;51:14;52:5; 56:8;58:18;67:18 stay (1) 98:24 staying (1) 120:3 stemming (1)	73:22 step (1) 107:23 steps (1) 130:1 still (7) 21:7;72:2;97:12,17; 110:8;121:3;135:21 stipulated (2) 47:22;82:22 stop (2) 104:10;111:4 storage (27) 98:4,21;99:11; 102:8;103:1;104:24; 105:9;106:13;107:17; 108:4,17,18;110:23; 118:15,21,24;121:12, 14;122:1,2,8,12,15; 123:4,16,22;125:3 store (2) 99:6;103:3 stored (1) 101:7 straightforward (1) 34:5 strengths (2) 45:11;81:6 striking (3) 94:19,20,20 string (1) 17:11 strong (1) 130:12 structure (1) 39:14 stuff (3) 106:20;121:16; 122:1 subject (6) 33:8;34:20;38:23; 53:4;82:18;124:11 subject-matter (4) 60:24;61:7;63:9; 76:15 submit (3) 17:19;31:20;38:6 submitted (6) 19:16,17;21:6; 22:18;28:5;86:6 submitting (1) 33:7 subsequent (2) 34:16;52:10 subsidiaries (1) 61:24 subsidiary (1) 63:21 substantial (6) 49:2;57:20;85:6; 86:16;88:10;89:10 substantially (1) 19:12	substantiate (3) 37:7;91:5;108:15 substantiating (2) 77:10;80:17 substantive (16) 9:23;14:13,15,22; 32:3;39:8;42:20;47:6, 8;50:16;51:23;53:7; 67:1;72:3;127:18; 129:1 stop (2) 34:12;38:12;50:23; 127:22 substitute (1) 57:12 success (5) 12:2;43:14,22; 56:23;81:4 successful (2) 43:21;45:8 succinctly (1) 71:17 sue (1) 82:16 sued (4) 75:8,18;86:1;88:5 Suffice (3) 41:5;82:13;88:23 sufficient (15) 22:20;37:22;54:19; 80:16;84:23;87:11, 18,24;88:19;89:1,8; 90:22;91:10;92:7; 110:2 sufficiently (1) 55:10 suggest (5) 105:7;130:21; 131:17;133:22,24 suggested (1) 111:15 suggesting (3) 124:14;131:5,6 suggestion (3) 37:25;103:9;111:13 suing (2) 63:25;68:17 suit (1) 75:12 summarily (3) 72:5;89:15;93:10 summary (1) 63:24 summons (1) 46:20 Superior (8) 13:7;43:10;51:19; 60:7;61:5;63:13,15; 65:21 supplemental (3) 103:14;105:8; 106:12 support (17)
--	---	--	--	--

February 15, 2023

40:16,24;48:18; 49:2;51:16;54:11; 73:12;79:11;85:6,17; 86:16;87:22;89:10, 20:93:14;122:9;124:2 supporting (1) 78:25 supports (2) 20:14;55:24 supposed (2) 107:18;124:16 Supreme (6) 22:11;57:17;66:14; 73:21;83:23;84:14 sure (20) 27:22;28:13;94:5, 21:104:23;105:3,9; 106:7;107:17;116:23; 117:5;119:12,17,22; 120:2;126:14;128:3; 129:14;130:17; 134:10 surgery (1) 134:11 surprise (1) 133:14 Surveyor (1) 99:3 surviving (1) 12:9 system (1) 126:7	telling (5) 16:21;98:14; 110:13;127:20,21 temporarily (1) 103:20 ten (2) 68:8;71:19 ten- (1) 68:5 tenet (1) 46:14 term (5) 9:3,22;13:7;19:20; 67:8 terms (24) 10:11;11:10;12:20; 17:17;19:24;30:8; 31:18;44:15;46:10; 57:22;82:21;83:8; 93:16;94:23;104:2; 106:5;108:21,21; 111:8;113:11;117:10, 25;125:9,22 Terrace (1) 89:3 test (7) 14:1;18:6;47:6; 76:5,19;120:10,11 testimony (1) 87:10 tests (1) 13:24 Texas (5) 16:13;52:13;74:19, 24;75:2 Thanks (2) 118:7;134:9 then-Chapter (1) 126:5 the-ordinary-course (1) 121:23 therefore (8) 35:9;52:16;70:17; 73:13;75:6;80:13; 92:5,24 therefrom (1) 50:21 thinking (2) 99:13;110:18 Third (10) 14:17;17:2;35:24; 42:20,20;49:20; 61:10;67:13;73:21; 94:12 third- (2) 20:4;49:17 third-party (4) 49:25;56:4,8;66:1 thirty (2) 33:12;42:13 thirty-two-million-dollar (1) 68:12 THMI (1)	63:21 THMI's (1) 63:22 though (5) 6:7;33:15;98:2; 104:22;109:6 thought (1) 29:2 threat (1) 68:2 Three (17) 10:25;11:3;20:22; 35:21;42:9,21;56:25; 59:3;64:19;84:7; 89:25;90:5;92:1; 94:13;125:17;127:9; 133:10 three-line (1) 73:8 three-sentence (1) 73:8 throughout (1) 24:8 thus (1) 16:11 tickets (2) 79:3;120:14 till (2) 39:22;95:6 time-consuming (1) 43:23 timely (1) 109:16 times (2) 89:25;129:5 timing (1) 118:11 title (4) 101:15,15;124:5,9 titled (1) 83:2 Tobacco (1) 64:16 today (16) 6:7;8:17;11:19; 19:15,18;31:20; 35:18,25;36:20; 105:23;118:19;119:2; 121:12;130:23;131:4; 135:23 today's (2) 6:9;10:3 together (1) 83:6 tomorrow (2) 105:24;111:6 took (5) 36:5;86:23;90:14; 91:9;127:1 Torosian (38) 8:3,4,5;106:16,17; 110:3,5,10,21;111:9, 12,22;112:23,25;	113:4,7,8,13,14; 114:22;115:4,6,25; 116:3,6;117:14; 128:7;129:25;130:2, 3;131:7,8;132:11,12, 17;135:18,19,24 Torosian's (1) 115:18 tort (16) 16:10,23;27:19; 28:4;47:10,15;53:14; 72:9,20;77:16;78:15, 16,22,25;80:5;82:18 tortfeasor (10) 23:8;27:22;30:17; 44:21;47:20;51:10; 74:6;83:16,18;88:25 tortfeasors (10) 23:18;30:11,14; 32:10;44:20;47:21; 58:19;74:13;82:17; 83:4 tortfeasor's (2) 47:23;84:1 tortious (2) 18:12;84:12 torts (2) 72:16;80:7 torture (2) 114:13,15 total (8) 25:18;48:21;50:13; 84:5;86:12,25;87:3; 91:12 totality-of-the-circumstances (1) 18:6 towards (1) 100:8 Toyota (3) 85:1,8;86:20 tracks (2) 27:16;33:9 tractor-trailer (1) 88:1 Trade (1) 64:16 traded (1) 19:1 transaction (1) 37:2 transactions (4) 37:1;65:10;79:4,22 transfer (1) 92:3 transferred (2) 70:7,9 transfers (3) 60:13;61:20;62:5 translates (1) 101:9 transparent (1) 39:1 treat (2)	6:8;90:16 treated (2) 35:12;38:4 treating (1) 125:24 treats (1) 50:22 trial (17) 18:8;26:20;45:7; 63:25;75:11,12,14,17; 76:4,6,9;81:2;84:10, 20;85:25;89:5;91:25 tribunal (1) 71:8 tried (1) 75:23 tries (1) 18:17 troubling (2) 93:6;101:20 truck (2) 88:2,4 true (5) 19:11;77:19;80:3; 121:8;122:9 trust (2) 85:22;108:11 trustee (211) 6:25;7:4,18;8:5; 10:5,7;11:11,13; 12:17;14:18;17:18, 24;20:10;21:4,21,22, 23;23:4;25:4,11,16; 27:19;28:3,16;29:17, 23,25;30:3,16,20,23; 31:2,6,8,11,22;32:4, 25;33:8,24;34:13; 35:11,20;36:3,6,14, 16,17,21;37:5,14; 38:15;40:14,16,24,25; 41:7,9,11;42:2,5,8,13, 21,24;43:5,7,9,12,18; 44:2,9,13,23;45:7,19; 46:8;48:1,10,12,23; 49:10;50:9,17,22,24; 51:5,22;52:1,7,13,16, 19;53:2,6,12,21,24; 54:9,22,24;55:3,12, 17,19,22;56:3,10,14; 57:4,12,25;58:5,13; 59:5,7,10,16,19;60:3; 61:12,16;62:2,7,11, 12,15,21;65:3,11,13; 66:6,25;67:21;69:22, 24;70:3,16,22;71:3, 20;72:5,19,25;73:2,5, 9,14,16,17,19;76:1, 13,21,23;77:2,8,16, 22;78:11,12;79:8,17; 80:7,10,14,16,22,24; 81:3,3,8,11;82:1,8; 85:15;89:19;90:5,12, 17,19,24;91:4,8,12;
T				
tactical (1) 75:11 talk (6) 9:9;97:4;111:3; 130:18,20,20 talked (1) 125:11 talking (5) 38:25;98:15,16; 100:15;118:19 talks (2) 14:9;26:12 Tax (2) 64:16;65:15 tea (1) 119:5 teaching (1) 134:23 Tech- (2) 87:19;92:22 Tech-Bilt (23) 18:23;21:11,14; 22:2;25:17;32:12; 45:2;49:6;52:5;54:10; 80:21,23;84:3,23; 85:3,14;86:10;88:16; 89:1,5;90:13;91:9; 92:17				

February 15, 2023

92:9,12,18,20,24; 93:7,12,16,18,94:7; 96:3,7;100:7;101:18; 106:17;118:12; 119:19;121:19;122:6, 18,25;124:2,8;126:3, 8;127:13 trustees (1) 124:20 trustee's (43) 12:1;19:3;27:2,25; 28:8;32:22;38:1;39:7; 45:11;47:4,12;48:21; 49:5;50:13;53:1,14, 19;58:9;59:19;60:4; 62:9,18,25;67:7; 71:15;72:8;73:6,18; 77:23;78:9;79:15; 80:6;81:6,19;89:14, 23;91:2,17,23;93:19; 95:11;96:18;113:17 try (2) 29:7;108:23 trying (8) 98:23;99:7;103:23; 105:19;119:5,10; 124:7;131:15 turn (6) 6:16;33:15;95:15; 98:3;99:16;101:25 turned (1) 116:20 turning (4) 34:2;42:2;56:13; 100:23 twelve (2) 11:2;19:5 twenty (1) 63:19 twenty-five (2) 39:25;87:3 two (49) 11:11;19:17;22:8; 23:12;24:18;30:10; 31:6,24,25;33:4;35:7, 9,14,16;36:1,12,18, 24;37:3,8;41:14;42:9; 50:22,25;56:23;59:1; 60:5;61:24;62:21; 63:18;66:6;73:20; 74:16;78:12;79:2; 84:6;86:7;87:14;90:2; 91:25;108:20;117:17; 125:17,25;126:1,10; 127:25;129:5;131:15 two-week (1) 131:2 type (5) 11:5;14:6;26:13; 56:9;93:25 types (1) 31:25 typical (1)	120:8 typically (1) 120:10 typing (2) 11:4,6 U ultimate (3) 34:21;39:4;104:14 ultimately (9) 34:11,13,20;44:11; 53:15;72:23;77:18; 126:24;127:13 unable (2) 11:14;101:1 unasserted (1) 60:25 unavailing (2) 77:19;92:14 unaware (1) 101:14 uncertain (4) 43:22;45:8;81:5; 94:23 uncontested (1) 88:22 uncontroversial (1) 96:9 under (68) 11:9,19;15:1,22; 17:21;18:3;20:12; 21:11;22:2;23:22; 24:9,12,15;32:7; 39:15,15;42:4;44:24; 47:25;48:18;51:8,14; 52:15,17,17;55:13,21; 58:16,20,25;59:1; 60:21;66:24;68:2,14, 23;70:23;71:1,3; 72:15;74:2,4,14; 76:21;77:14;78:18; 80:21;85:19;86:15; 87:24;88:9,14;92:15, 22;95:11;103:14,16; 105:13;106:9,17,22; 107:4;109:18;111:13; 118:23;120:5;121:5; 125:15 underlying (6) 29:12;32:11;33:1; 37:1;75:22;87:19 underscore (1) 25:11 underscoring (1) 23:22 Understood (4) 105:7;109:5;117:1; 128:5 undertake (1) 23:2 undisputed (2) 78:20;90:24	unenforceable (1) 74:7 unfair (1) 79:10 unfairly (1) 29:16 unforeseen (1) 101:13 Union (6) 68:6,21;73:20;75:8, 15;76:14 United (1) 64:15 Universal (18) 7:13;10:17,21;27:7; 33:16;34:3;35:4; 40:22;46:3;50:15,24; 56:11;71:6;95:23; 96:10,11;116:10; 125:25 University (1) 90:16 unless (7) 28:10;38:17;44:15; 82:20;98:10;133:7; 134:22 unlike (1) 76:14 unlimited (1) 56:17 unnecessary (1) 51:17 unnoticed (1) 94:4 unopposed (1) 77:5 unpublished (3) 51:20;60:7;61:5 unredacted (2) 105:9,14 unremarkable (1) 17:13 unsecured (2) 41:10;62:24 unsolicited (1) 9:20 unsupportive (1) 45:23 unwieldy (2) 113:3,9 unwilling (1) 55:14 up (17) 16:5,23;20:16;34:7; 40:7;62:17;68:7; 94:20;95:6;108:7; 111:5;118:9,16; 119:15,24;120:3; 134:7 upheld (1) 63:11 upload (1) 95:2	upon (11) 23:4;27:23;31:3,12, 23;57:9;62:14;89:8; 102:22;126:25; 127:25 urgency (2) 105:18,22 urges (1) 29:10 USA (18) 40:17;41:6;50:18; 53:16;72:24;78:10, 13,15,17,19,20;79:13, 21;125:24;127:6,11; 128:14,24 USC (1) 58:25 use (9) 14:20;33:4;66:15; 108:11;118:14;120:6; 122:6;126:4,6 used (3) 27:12;51:3;99:16 using (1) 20:16 utilized (3) 76:19,22;87:17 V vacated (1) 69:18 Valentin (7) 87:25;88:3,4,8,12, 12,14 valuable (1) 124:17 valuation (3) 87:11;96:24;100:13 value (12) 87:19;96:18; 100:10,12;101:19; 102:9,18,23;104:7; 107:1,3;110:19 values (1) 104:14 various (7) 22:8;36:14;40:15, 15;65:4;88:5;89:9 vast (1) 32:25 vehicle (3) 51:24;67:2;88:3 verdict (2) 75:13;82:16 version (2) 106:12,14 versus (3) 55:25;66:17;128:24 vertical (1) 120:9 VI (1) 79:1	via (12) 8:19;46:7;51:15; 57:24;58:1,4;59:21; 61:11;67:3,17,22; 95:2 viable (1) 24:6 video (5) 6:16,17;95:15,16; 116:20 videos (3) 8:16;95:13;135:21 view (5) 28:8;57:15;110:10; 118:11,23 views (1) 57:3 VII (1) 79:1 violates (3) 43:5;94:14,16 Virgin (1) 78:5 virtue (2) 20:11;90:3 vis-a-vis (2) 22:8;24:21 visibility (6) 22:6,7,9,19;39:14; 101:3 voluntary (1) 62:9 VRC (4) 60:14,14,17,20 W wages (1) 121:4 wait (5) 59:24;93:20; 101:22;109:1;129:8 waited (1) 125:17 Waldemar (1) 87:25 walled (2) 9:24,25 Walter (1) 79:20 wants (3) 19:19;38:15;107:22 Ward (4) 61:16;62:7,13;63:1 Ward's (2) 61:21;63:7 warrant (6) 97:7,21,23;98:15, 17,19 warrants (1) 97:20 Washington (2) 75:19;78:2
---	--	---	---	---

February 15, 2023

wasteful (1) 17:4	25:6;111:16;130:9	108:25	23;68:9,14,23;69:9, 15,21,25	133:6
water (11) 99:17,21;100:2,3,5, 9,12,18,24;101:6,7	windfall (1) 37:13	wrap (1) 99:22	Zale's (2) 67:25;68:5	12:13 (2) 95:5,8
way (18) 16:17;25:9;26:13, 20:34;10,24;36:25; 39:17;65:11;103:23; 105:20;108:24;112:6; 114:24;115:15;118:3; 121:1;133:4	Winthrop (1) 7:22	writ (3) 61:25;64:11;101:2	Zetta (40) 6:14;9:24,24;23:21; 24:21;40:4,17,17,17; 41:6,6,11;50:18,18; 53:16;72:13,24;73:1; 78:10,12,12,15,15,17, 19,20;79:12,13,13,20, 21,21;95:10;117:23; 125:24,24;127:6; 128:13,14,19	1251 (1) 89:4
ways (2) 48:25;107:11	wise (1) 57:19	write (1) 11:5	Zetta-BAC (1) 47:14	12621185 (1) 54:3
weaknesses (2) 45:11;81:6	wish (7) 6:16;27:4;33:18; 128:20;129:24; 132:24;135:22	writing (1) 116:3		135 (1) 78:18
WEDNESDAY (2) 6:1;135:3	wishes (2) 8:17;9:1	Writs (8) 14:21;15:2;59:1; 64:12;65:22;66:11; 67:10,12		1377 (1) 56:20
Wednesdays (1) 134:23	withdraw (2) 11:17;42:19	written (2) 25:9;41:5		14 (2) 26:6;76:25
week (3) 9:11;125:17,19	withdrawal (1) 62:9	wrong (1) 36:6	1	15 (2) 6:1;21:21
weeks (5) 106:1;109:25; 125:17,17;131:16	within (20) 12:8;15:5;26:21; 42:9,13,21;51:6; 52:10;60:5;61:13; 66:4,10,20;67:11; 69:25;83:25;87:12; 95:2;101:19;120:22	wrongdoing (1) 33:1		15,000 (1) 88:12
Weeks-Grey (3) 62:4,25;63:5	without (28) 18:16;26:19;36:22; 37:19;38:15,16; 39:18;41:18,21;46:4; 50:19,20;52:11;53:4; 55:14;56:11;58:14; 69:8;77:11;82:15; 92:6;94:7;108:22; 117:12,19;123:13,17; 125:10	wrongful-death (1) 63:20	1 (1) 79:12	150,000 (4) 75:15;101:10; 121:13;122:5
weigh (5) 33:11;44:5;114:12; 119:7;125:5	WL (3) 54:3;84:20;85:16	wrongs (1) 32:20	1.7-million-dollar (1) 64:16	151,000 (1) 104:23
weighs (1) 43:19	wonderful (1) 21:12	Wu (1) 124:15	1:15 (2) 95:6,8	15th (2) 109:11;131:4
welcome (1) 126:18	wondering (1) 114:1	Y	10 (4) 17:11;95:10;132:7; 133:3	16 (5) 60:21;61:2,2;65:22; 66:11
well-established (2) 57:16;59:11	work (8) 9:23;37:18;99:10; 119:17,23;128:13,22; 131:22	yacht (11) 99:20;102:1;103:3; 104:3;114:25;118:12, 13,25;120:18;121:9; 123:7	10:20 (2) 39:21;40:1	17.1 (1) 42:19
well-known (1) 13:21	worked (1) 90:1	yachts (2) 99:18;121:4	10:45 (2) 39:22,25	17th (7) 94:6;134:4,10,14, 21,22;135:3
weren't (1) 105:2	working (3) 97:13,14;117:22	yard (1) 99:17	10:48 (1) 40:1	19 (1) 21:22
West (1) 40:7	workings (1) 9:11	year (14) 9:4;11:12;41:24; 42:12;63:17;65:2; 100:8,8,14,15;105:1; 109:2;133:9,15	100 (1) 46:13	192 (1) 89:4
what's (5) 13:17;121:20; 125:9;128:22,22	works (4) 132:2,7,22;134:4	years (2) 99:15;100:19	100,000 (1) 105:4	1985 (1) 45:2
when/if (1) 125:2	world (1) 119:18	yesterday (1) 96:14	105 (18) 14:7,9,13,14,21; 42:4;51:23;59:1; 60:21;61:2,2;64:5,10; 65:22;66:11,15,24; 67:1	1986 (1) 56:20
whereas (3) 19:2;32:22;52:15	worldwide (1) 101:17	York (18) 16:9,13;17:9;21:3; 23:9,22;24:15;47:15, 19;48:1;53:17,19; 72:10,16,25;74:19,24; 75:1	100,000-dollar (1) 87:2	1990 (1) 85:2
Whereupon (1) 135:25	worse (1) 110:17	Z	10's (1) 79:13	1993 (1) 71:23
whichever (2) 47:23;82:24	worth (1) 122:23	Zahnleuter (8) 85:16,19,23;86:1,4, 5,20,21	10th (1) 42:11	1995 (2) 52:8;65:25
whole (5) 25:5;33:4;37:23; 112:7;121:10	worthwhile (1)	Zahnleuter's (1) 86:25	11 (14) 10:4;35:22;36:5,6, 10;40:3;41:6,7;46:17; 58:25;61:14;64:15; 67:23;126:6	1996 (1) 60:6
wholly-owned (1) 63:21		Zale (15) 13:11;14:24;15:6; 52:7,9;65:24;67:22,	1183 (1) 66:18	1st (3) 109:10,25;131:5
whose (2) 9:13;75:5			11th (6) 40:24;41:1;54:21; 89:21;90:11;91:7	2
wife (1) 61:21			12 (1)	2.875 (1) 75:17
willing (3)				2:12 (1) 135:25

2005 (1) 52:12 200-million-dollar (1) 28:3 2013 (1) 66:18 2014 (1) 54:3 2016 (5) 112:21;124:25; 125:10,20,24 2016-2 (1) 95:11 2017 (2) 41:7;100:11 2018 (2) 84:20,21 2021 (2) 85:16;94:6 2023 (2) 6:1;100:15 21 (2) 21:22;41:16 214 (1) 54:3 217,000 (1) 64:21 22 (2) 8:14;77:1 220 (1) 85:2 225 (6) 101:22;105:5; 108:22;121:13;123:4; 125:11 225,000 (6) 101:9;104:22; 108:11;122:5,15; 123:12 22nd (4) 131:22;132:10,22; 133:3 23 (1) 126:11 28th (2) 41:16;134:4 29th (7) 40:19;49:6;50:12; 54:20;81:22;89:21,24 3 3 (1) 72:6 3.25 (1) 75:13 3.4 (1) 100:11 343 (1) 94:18 349 (1) 77:1 350 (1)	75:15 350,000 (1) 60:15 363 (5) 15:8,9;70:5;124:12, 18 368 (1) 126:12 38 (1) 45:2 384 (1) 78:24 4 4 (1) 13:6 4.75-million-dollar (1) 42:14 400,000 (2) 60:15;86:25 4007 (1) 66:23 459 (1) 46:11 488 (1) 45:2 4975392 (1) 85:17 5 5 (1) 13:6 50,000 (9) 104:17,17;108:20, 21,21;117:12,12; 125:10,10 50/50 (1) 37:10 500,000-dollar (1) 79:2 524 (2) 20:11;56:6 524e (1) 20:7 6 6 (1) 14:3 6242155 (1) 84:21 65 (6) 13:20;14:11;15:1; 52:6,9;58:15 650,000 (1) 64:23 7 7 (19) 7:4;27:25;31:13;	35:23;36:8,16,16,18; 40:14,16;41:8;43:1; 46:12;61:15,15;65:2, 3;95:10;96:7 7001 (8) 13:4;15:3;46:5; 69:12,14;70:17; 71:18,22 70017 (9) 13:16;46:1;58:3,21, 23;67:15;70:22,24,25 7001's (2) 57:25;58:8 7016 (2) 14:17;15:2 7016c2 (1) 58:25 7065 (1) 71:1 720 (1) 66:17 75,000 (1) 101:10 750,000 (1) 62:17 784 (1) 56:20 7th (1) 109:12 8 864 (1) 85:2 866 (1) 44:18 871 (1) 85:9 877 (9) 21:8;22:23;30:24; 32:1;48:6,13;74:3; 77:15;82:14 877.6 (42) 11:20;13:11,16; 15:24,25;16:1,12; 17:18;18:3,16;20:12; 31:10;32:5;48:6,13; 51:8,14,24;52:10,15, 18;53:11;54:1;55:13; 56:6;59:2;67:3;71:3; 74:3;81:25;83:2; 84:14;85:14,19;86:9, 15;87:24;88:14; 89:20;90:10;92:17,20 877b (1) 44:18 887.6 (1) 27:15 890,000 (1) 65:1 9	9 (4) 132:7;134:21,22; 135:3 9.5 (3) 11:10;42:8;50:11 9.5-million-dollar (2) 45:5;80:25 9/13 (1) 41:11 9/7 (2) 41:24,24 9:29 (1) 6:1 9006 (1) 66:23 9019 (43) 9:23;10:4;11:22; 12:21;13:3,6;14:8; 15:10,16,23;16:4; 31:5;40:6,12;42:4; 51:15,25;52:13,17; 56:13;57:24;58:6,20, 23,25;59:1,8;61:11; 62:11,15,25;63:12; 65:13;67:3;69:23; 70:13;80:10;92:16, 18,21,25;94:25; 125:22 91,062.26 (1) 41:10 923 (1) 71:23 925,000 (1) 62:8 965,000 (1) 65:6 995 (1) 71:23 9th (3) 56:20;66:18;71:23
--	---	--	--